



Christian Order

Summary of Contents for November 1977

ACTIONS SPEAK

Jean Horn

"TIME FOR BUILDING": A
COMMENTARY : 2

The Editor

BISHOP LUCEY AND THE NEW LITURGY

Press Report

A BISHOP TO HIS BROTHER
BISHOPS

Archbishop Pintonello

THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS :
LITURGY AND THEOLOGY

W. J. Morgan

A SPEECH AND A LETTER

*Alfred Marnau and
Eric de Saventhem*

PRO FIDE
MAJOR MEETING

SPEAKERS :

MR. PATRICK WALL, M.P.

FR. PAUL CRANE, S.J.

CAXTON HALL

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 29th

7 p.m.

PLEASE BE THERE

Contents

Page

642	PRACTICE AND PREACHING	The Editor
644	ACTIONS SPEAK	Jean Horn
650	A VISIT TO CZECHOSLOVAKIA	Aid to Church in Need
654	BISHOP LUCEY AND THE NEW LITURGY	The Editor
656	"TIME FOR BUILDING" : A COMMENTARY : 2	The Editor
668	"TIME FOR BUILDING" : A CRITIQUE	Pro Fide
671	A BISHOP TO HIS BROTHER BISHOPS	Archbishop Pintonello
677	TWO RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CONFESSORS	Anonymous
681	SACRIFICE OF THE MASS	W. J. Morgan
692	A SPEECH AND A LETTER	Alfred Marnau & Eric de Saventhem
698	ANY QUESTIONS ?	William Lawson, S.J.
701	BOOK REVIEWS	Paul Crane, S.J.

If You Change Your Address :

Please let us know two or three weeks ahead if possible and please send us both new and old addresses. Thank you.

Christian Order is a monthly magazine devoted to the promulgation of Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs in Church and State; at home and abroad; in the political, social and industrial fields.

It is published by Father Paul Crane, S.J., from 65, Belgrave Rd., London, S.W.1. This is the sole postal address to which all communications concerning *Christian Order* should be sent.

Christian Order is obtainable only by subscription and from this address. In the case of those desiring more than one copy, these are obtainable at the subscription rate and should be paid for in advance.

The annual subscription to *Christian Order* is £1 in the United Kingdom and Republic of Ireland; \$3.00 in the United States, Canada and Australia; elsewhere, according to the approximate sterling rate of exchange, in the currency of the country concerned or any convenient currency.

Air-mail rates as follows :

U.S.A., Canada
India, etc.—£4.00, U.S. \$8.00
Australia—£4.50, A. \$8.00
N. Zealand—£4.50, N.Z. \$8.00

Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

VOLUME 18

NOVEMBER, 1977

NUMBER 11

Practice and Preaching

THE EDITOR

LAST May, I wrote a letter to the *Catholic Herald* in comment on a sentence in its editorial for the 18th of that month. "Christians", observed the Editor, "must be in the front line in the defence against human rights". I wrote back agreeing and added:

"I would be interested to learn the reaction of your readers to the suggestion that, amongst these rights, one may number the following three:

"The right of a Catholic, as a human being, to the practice of his religion in a matter which accords with and expresses correctly the substance of its true and traditional beliefs.

"The right to be taught the substance of these beliefs.

"The right of redress before — and, therefore, of access to — recognised and competent authority in the event of the violation of the first two rights".

In effect my letter was somewhat messed up when reproduced in the *Catholic Herald*. This could account for the fact that there was no response to it. Yet what lay between the lines of my letter was, I believe, not merely correct, but of the most vital concern to the Church today. What I was saying by implication, as gently as I could, was that every Catholic has a right to the truth of his religion, which is God's truth, as contained within the Catholic Church, and that this basic right carries with it, amongst other things, the additional triple right . . . i . . . to forms of

liturgical and devotional practice which contain and express this truth . . . ii . . . to be taught this truth at home, at school and in Church . . . iii . . . to seek redress before recognised and competent ecclesiastical authority in the event of these first two rights being violated.

It is, I think, clear that, within the Catholic Church today, the first of these rights is being violated by liturgical and devotional practices that do not express the truth — if at all or inadequately; but tend, on the contrary, to corrode it. It is necessary to point out that, thereby, a fundamental right of the Catholic human being is being violated and that such violation is unjust. It is also clear that, in very many cases, Catholic children in schools — as well as adult Catholics in adult educational centres and congregations of Catholics in church—are likewise not being taught the truth of their religion. On the contrary, the reverse in many cases. It is necessary to point out that those responsible are violating a fundamental right of the Catholic human being and that such violation is contrary to justice, which demands that we render to others that which is their due — in this case, God's truth as contained within the Catholic Faith. Finally, it is clear that those seeking redress — which they have every right to do — for any violation of these rights, are either not being heard or heard effectively by recognised and competent ecclesiastical authority which is, in consequence, no longer credible where they are concerned. Once again, then, we have the violation of yet another basic right and, hence, an offence against justice, which sees man's due, in this case, as that of having his complaint heard and, where it is valid, effective action taken to redress a balance rendered unfavourable by previous injustice.

I conclude with a thought. Never before in its history has the Church been so concerned as today with questions of justice, where the affairs of men in the world are concerned. At the same time, never before in its history has it appeared as less concerned with those same questions where the affairs of its own children within the Church are concerned. Its position is thus contradictory; indeed, hypocritical, for it is not practising what it preaches. Until it does so, I do not see how its preaching can be taken seriously or have lasting effect.

This month, Jean Horn, the Catholic psychologist, whose article in the May issue of *Christian Order* aroused concern as well as interest, turns to the sinister significance of certain liturgical changes within the contemporary Church.

Actions Speak

"But do thou be Watchful . . ." (Tim. II. Chap. 4, v. 5)

JEAN HORN

"**T**RAPS for the Unwary", (*Christian Order*, July '77) was an attempt to raise an alarm; to alert the man and woman in the pew to the striking and important changes in our worship, other than the verbal changes, of the post-conciliar liturgical reform. "Actions speak louder than words" is not an old saw, but a proven fact. A greeting without a smile is no greeting at all, and we who have just enjoyed the pageantry and ritual of the Silver Jubilee cannot fail to have been moved by some aspect of the royal journeying. The Queen does not have much chance to *say* things to her subjects, yet she conveys a subtle blend of dignity, friendliness and simplicity that needs no words. And she smiles. How she smiles! One wonders how she keeps it up, as the car sweeps past the waving miles of faces and flags. Yet if she doesn't smile the onlookers are saddened, "She didn't smile at us".

Since what we do not only influences others, but also has a kind of boomerang effect on our own attitudes, the Queen must be a very pleasant person by now. All that smiling and courtesy must affect her as well as her subjects, since she is psychologically no different from the rest of us. The recent tours have presumed also another human quality in the royal personages; adaptability. Humans are terribly adaptable. We can get used to almost anything. For royalty on walk-about this is probably an advantage. For mankind as a whole it may not be.

A Film on B.B.C. 2

Some readers may have seen a film on B.B.C. 2 about twelve months ago. It showed the work of a Yale psycholo-

gist, Stanley Milgram, who set up a fake project to test the responses of ordinary "normal" people to a far from ordinary activity. He also wanted to see how far we are susceptible to someone we regard as a "legitimate authority". Do you recall the firm and the quite shocking findings? A large random sample of people were asked to help the University. They were told that important research in learning was involved. What was also involved was the giving of increasingly powerful electric shocks to a "learner" with a weak heart — as they thought. And most of them did it! Most of them went on, and on, and on giving the shocks to the hidden but audible "victim"; went on doing as they were told. This important study may be read in full by the curious or the disbelieving. (Milgram. *S. Obedience to Authority*. Tavistock Press, London, 1974; and *Behavioural Study of Obedience; Journal of Abnormal & Social Psychology*, No. 67, 1963.)

We all tend to think; "But I'd never do that". Perhaps not, perhaps yes. We like to think we are "normal", but it is normal people who are often most adaptable. On debriefing, Milgram's subjects, who had gone on obediently risking another's life, gave a number of interesting excuses. Some said they'd promised to help and felt obliged to complete the experiments; some said that the University was a responsible body (or was supposed to be) and that the psychologist was to blame for any disasters, anyway; *he'd* told them to do it. Others reasoned that *so many* people couldn't be cruel and careless. They tended to feel "safe" in the crowd. They were so wrong; so tragically wrong.

We who are old enough to recall the Nazi war-crime trials and who heard the prisoners' pathetic explanations over and over again, should not be surprised at Milgram's findings. "I was ordered": "We all did it": "I didn't do it myself, I just told the men what I'd been ordered to tell them" and "Somehow you didn't think, you got used to it". So we may all shuffle off our consciences. People do not like to stand out from the crowd. People are not generally heroic — alone. People can also become insensitive (desensitized if you prefer) to circumstances they would earlier have found shocking or intolerable. We do, sadly, get used to bad things as well as good.

The Priest and his Flock

Where is all this leading and what has it to do with the Catholic Faith? Well, it is leading back to the general topic of non-verbal communication, but with a special eye to those who are in authority over us, our priests. The relation of the psychologist in the Yale experiment to his subjects has elements in common with that between a priest and his flock. The priest is certainly looked on as someone of "legitimate authority"; the greatest local authority, perhaps. He has a very special role in the Catholic community. What is even more resounding in the Catholic psyche is the recognition that he is a man "chosen by God". He therefore wields a quite extraordinary power and influence in his own human right, leaving aside sacramental grace which is, in any case, not under discussion here.

I wonder how many lay-people share my curiosity about our priests? Their response to some of the post-Conciliar liturgical changes is intriguing. We do not expect to be told how you feel, Father, but rumours abound. All those things which you used to do and no longer do; all those that you now do that you did not do before; how is it Fathers, with you? We know that you vary immensely, irrespective of age. "Fr. X doesn't really like facing the people", "Fr. Y worries about giving Communion in the hand", "Fr. Z enjoys wearing flannels at the Youth Club", "Fr. S kisses you as you leave". All quotes, capable of endless permutation. Well, Fathers all, it's certain that the departures from both liturgical and behavioural traditions have been *real* departures. Maybe you found universality finicky and boring. Repetition is boring unless it expresses something perfectly, for you. We ponder over your position now. Do you resort to pin-sticking, as has been suggested by your more ribald parishioners? Do you select your "options", as we do the Pools? Or are you weighed down with the worry of trying to hold the die-hard traditionalists, while attracting the young and being "moderate" all at once? We sympathise and we watch you—hopefully.

We watch you; especially that. We watch your actions more than we listen to you. We wonder whether you consider the implications of some of your actions or whether those who "refresh" you on your many Courses and meetings fully explain the "why" of some of the ideas they sell

you. It cannot be over-emphasized that whatever you *do* affects us when you're up there in front of us. It always has. The evidence from the sciences of human behaviour is that your actions speak volumes. We often miss your words anyway, especially when your microphone's on-the-blink or too loud or we're a bit deaf. Even when we do hear a clear and richly-modulated delivery, if your actions belie or fail to support your word *we* will be aware of it, and so will you.

Turning the Altars Round

Let us concentrate on one issue only. When you turned your altars round, when you faced us, you turned your back on the Blessed Sacrament. Anyone, priest or layman, who thinks: "Oh, not that old hobby-horse again: we've dealt with that successfully" should perhaps read on a bit or else read more widely. It could well be argued that your acquiescence in turning your back was one of the most potent influences in the steady undermining of Catholic doctrine concerning the Blessed Sacrament. Pope Paul has reiterated the traditional teachings, solemnly and carefully, yet your actions often belie his words.

We suppose that priests who turned round had, on the whole, no intention of eroding anything essential to the Faith; not even of upsetting old Mrs. Ever-cum-late whom it is so very hard to resist upsetting. We credit you with being obedient, Fathers. Why not, after all? Most of you had always lived that peaceful way and you probably hadn't read Ralph Wiltgen's startling "blow-by-blow" account of the Council while still available in English. Why should you? There was no reason to suspect the onset of a second reformation back in the mid-nineteen-sixties. You probably still trusted Rome. We wonder, we wonder very much . . . do you still?

Christ is behind You, Father

"Get thee behind me", said Our Lord to Satan, in poor St. Peter. Behind. Now he is often behind you. Odd, to say the least. Many of us wonder why (since it was not and is not, mandatory) you all turned your altars round. Presumably you would reply, like the Nazi soldier or the American citizen; "It was put to me on good authority that I should, so I did". So, as though you were a man at a

party who wants to shuffle off an unwanted bore, you turned your back on Him and your face towards us. We saw you and you saw us, but *we* also kept seeing the Tabernacle behind your back. The unwanted guest was supposed to be the host at this party; how odd. Since you didn't and often still don't seem to care, we get the message well, its hard to put into acceptable words. Your action is a denial of what you usually *say* about the contents of the Tabernacle (hole-in-the-wall, marble box etc.). So we may *seem* to accept what you say, but at a much deeper level we get the message. We have all been "cold-shouldered" at some time. We *feel* that gesture and you cannot talk it away.

You have arranged matters better than this? Well, a few have. They have raised the Tabernacle or used a hanging pyx. Now this conveys its own message; *above* us, above you, high up; to be looked up to. This is consistent with Catholic doctrine. Even the theological objection to the separation of the priest at Mass from the Blessed Sacrament is partially overcome by this solution. But it is rare. One wonders why, once more.

Some of you, no doubt well-intentioned, have reserved the Host in a side chapel, as in a Cathedral, convincing yourself, perhaps, that this is better, because we can retreat in there for our private prayers. We can, of course. We can, but the message is again clear: *you have put Him aside, you have*, and you cannot shuffle off that responsibility or fail to reckon with that message that is echoing down the naves of many a church today. Our very adaptability is a danger in situations like this. "You'll get used to it", our Anglican friends say. We will indeed, but *should* we?

A Third "Solution"

There is a third solution to the problem of where to put the Tabernacle. It is the worst, but sadly could be the one resorted to, not by the worst but by the best (especially the young and unsure) priests. There is a useful term in modern psychology; a "double-bind" situation. It means that you have only two alternatives and both will lead you into more trouble, in rather unscientific terms. Any family man knows what a double-bind is like. You wash up, to help, and get told off for putting things in the wrong places.

You feel a nuisance. Or you don't wash up and feel lazy and a bit guilty. Well you can decide to wash, then get annoyed when faults are found, or you can opt out and feel ashamed. In both cases you'll be psychologically uncomfortable because, really, you want to be nice to your wife and have her nice to you. However, since it's easy to walk away and hide behind the paper, this is what you may do, and you may get so used to it that you fail to feel guilty any more. So you adapt, too. People cannot stay in a situation of psychological discomfort. A sensitive priest who says Mass with a constant undercurrent of apology to the presence behind him will not stay in that situation long. He may "put aside" if his church permits, or he may be able to raise funds for the hanging pyx, but, if not, he has no other way out. It is entirely *within* him, but it *seems* to solve his problem. He can begin to listen to the doubts being thrown on the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation by the modernist lunatic fringe. If to celebrate Mass facing the people and, therefore, with his back to Christ is unbearable, it is possible to turn a psychological somersault and deny that He is there. Once used to that, the priest is, perhaps, at peace? We cannot know. What we do know is that he is not a Catholic now.

A Clear-Cut Issue

One issue at least is clear-cut. Either we have God on our altars or we have not. If we have, it follows that certain behaviour is appropriate and some is not. We are creatures; He is our Creator. If we have not, then very different behaviour may be quite reasonable for both priest and people. But the two groups cannot merge. At the present time, we, the subjects of ecclesiastical experiments, are getting a cacophony of messages from "legitimate authority". Those who are convinced that the Holy Spirit has not been a liar for the last 1900 years and, equally, that the criteria of man-discovered science do not necessarily apply in the spiritual realm, may refuse to comply with some of the instructor's requests. If this seems arrogant to milder souls, let them ponder whether it approaches in any degree the arrogance of men who have reversed the order of the two great commandments, and who have put God in His place—out of the sanctuary and into our hands. Actions speak; listen to *them* in your heart.

A recent visitor to Czechoslovakia was appalled at the fear he met with again and again. Fear of a system, in which it is better not to be noticed, so that people submit slavishly to all regulations. The priests too with whom he spoke were living in fear, in their case not of the system but for the future of the Church, which has been brought to the brink of destruction by persecution of an intensity unknown before. At times this persecution takes on brutal forms, as in the words of a police official: "We'll see to it that there are no more Sisters here by 1980 so that the children will no longer know what sort of beings they are". But generally the persecution is more subtle. A priest expressed it thus: "They no longer strike the shepherd but try to scatter the flock so that the shepherd is left standing entirely on his own. They also misuse the Church authorities in order to destroy the Church". Acknowledgements to *Aid to the Church in Need*, 3-5 North St., Chichester, West Sussex.

A Visit to Czechoslovakia

Scattering the Flock

Various methods are employed, such as

1. Material discrimination against the faithful :
 - the premium paid to parents on a kolkhose collective farm at the birth of a child is four times less if they have their baby baptised than if they do not have it baptised; the same applies to the marriage premium if a couple marry in church;
 - parents who enter their children's names for religious instruction are officially informed that they are endangering their children's future;
 - students who have taken part in religious instruction are usually not admitted to higher education and never to the university;
 - teachers who attend church are dismissed.

- . The spiritual poisoning of children :
 - children of 11 or 12 years are given the following questionnaire: Do you believe in God? Do you go to church? Do you believe in eternal life, in the fairy tale of Snow White and that it brings good luck to touch wood? Which is better: faith or science? Has anyone ever proved to you that God or other fairy-tale characters make people happier? Have you taken part in religious instruction?
 - the headmaster advises these children: “Don’t write that you believe in God or the school will get a bad name. Even if you do believe in God you can write “no”. That is only a little lie that will be forgiven the next time you go to confession”
- . The obstruction or prevention of pastoral activity :
 - The permission of the Communist Party Secretary must be obtained for any pastoral activity in another parish. This permission is mostly given too late (for example only at the beginning of January does a priest receive the news that he was authorised to help hear confessions at Christmas in another parish);
 - for every public activity pertaining to his work the bishop must apply to the government Church Office for a permit (for example the consecration of the altar in a newly restored church is often postponed because in the Party’s opinion the date is unsuitable);
 - for every improvement of church buildings costing more than 500 crowns (50 dollars) a permit must be obtained; this is often refused “because all energy is needed for the promotion of Socialism”.
- . Restrictions on the training of priests in the seminaries :
 - a student intending to enter a seminary becomes thereby a disgrace to the school” and is worked on in the most brutal manner to make him give up his purpose;
 - the decision on who should be admitted to the seminary does not lie with the bishop but with a Communist official;
 - on the orders of the Party good seminarians are dismissed from the seminary or are not admitted to ordination;
 - the quality of the professors is at times decidedly poor because the best of them are removed by the Party.

5. The systematic withdrawal of pastoral permits :

— as the best young priests lose their pastoral permits, older ones have to take over more and more parishes, which is beyond their strength;

— there is talk of pensioning all priests over 60 years of age and sending them—as has been done with the Sisters—to “homes for old priests” (concentration camps).

6. Pastors who set a bad example are promoted by the Party :

— a priest who as a result of years of imprisonment is suffering from a persecution complex and in his fear of spies has taken to drink, carries on in his church in such a manner that the faithful run off. The bishop is powerless because the Party opposes the removal of the priest;

— the bishop may not punish a priest living in concubinage but must appoint him on the orders of the Party as priest in charge of one of the largest parishes.

The Autodestruction of the Church

The most dangerous means of achieving this end is the Peace Priests Movement. “We must light a little candle for the devil now so as to be able to let one burn for God later”. These words of a peace priest express both the policy and also the fateful confusion of this Movement. The peace priests are not there to spread the Faith or defend the Church but to sing the praises of the Party and proclaim that there is freedom in a Socialist State. With the help of the Party they have conquered all key positions in the Church, so that the Communists know exactly what is going on in the Church. They are tools of the atheists, making a hollow administrative structure out of a living Church.

Unfortunately these tools — men without will power — are now to be found in the hierarchy too. A priest told me sadly of a bishop whose pride it was to have written a pastoral letter on the blessings of Socialism and the duty to take part in the elections, which was passed without the slightest modification by the Communist Secretary in the State Church Office.

As priests who have emigrated considerably strengthen the Church's powers of resistance by the help and informa-

ion they give their fellow priests at home, their influence is now being counteracted in every imaginable way. They are labelled together with all opponents of the regime and all anti-social elements. A bishop — unfortunately not an example of apostolic care for souls — has already requested the government to condemn these “enemies of the State”. Priests in Czechoslovakia will presumably soon have to sign a declaration explicitly dissociating themselves from them. It is also feared that the Communists may use diplomatic ways to induce the Vatican to impose silence on emigrant and refugee priests in return for a few so-called “liberties”. This would be of great service to the Communist Regime. A priest expressed himself thus : ‘Diplomacy does not make martyrs, but produces forgotten groups and persons who have been written off’.

For how long?

A Catholic mother put her fear in the following words : ‘We have been fighting for our Faith for 25 years now. We have borne everything. But we often wonder how long we can still hold out. And above all we wonder will our children hold out?’

In deep admiration for many laymen and priests of this persecuted Church we believe that we can say : Yes there is still hope. This Church still lives ! We remember the Sunday Mass we attended, at which the church proved far too small to accommodate all the worshippers. We remember a city in which no churches could be built in the new suburbs, but where in a church in the city centre seven Masses are attended every day by a huge crowd of faithful Christians. We remember the postulants and novices of a congregation dissolved by the State who in spite of all prohibitions are finding new forms of communal life. And above all we remember the “Church of the catacombs” which the Government at the request of a bishop mindless of his duty will presumably shortly condemn and persecute as a “political Church”.

From this Church of the catacombs, founded on rock-like faith, the new martyrs are being born who may rescue the Church in Czechoslovakia. They are ready to go to the utmost.

BISHOP LUCEY AND THE NEW LITURGY

The Dublin *Catholic Standard* carried an interview with Bishop Lucey of Cork and Ross in its September 14th, 1973 issue, which is published under the above caption. The Bishop was particularly critical of those who invoke "the spirit of Vatican II" or "the spirit of Pope John" to justify practices which neither had sanctioned.

According to Bishop Lucey, this personal interpretation or misinterpretation of the Council is found in every sphere, for example :

"In the liturgy, because we didn't turn around all the altars (which, incidentally, in this diocese, would cost between 500,000 and three quarters of a million pounds), we are told that you have disobeyed the Council. In point of fact, the Council never said anything at all about the position of the altar. And remember too that the Council *never said that the Mass should be in the vernacular!* And what has been lost of course in regard to the vernacular, is the poetry, the beauty and the appeal of language . . . We now have jounanlese in the Bible especially, and indeed in the Mass".

The *Catholic Standard* quotes Bishop Lucey as being *convinced that the new translation of the bible had left people more ignorant of the bible* and that the reforms in this area were *useless* . . . Bishop Lucey saw the greatest threat to the Church being the current emergence of the "expert" in every area of life. In the Council, theological "experts" were *more influential than most bishops*, even though they had no vote, "because they had the ear of a Cardinal or the head of a national group of bishops, and they were influential in *the drafting of Council documents*. The expert . . . is the person with power. That, for instance, is what is happening in the Church today. That is the way a theologian can rank above the Pope. That is why the biblical scholar ranks above the person whose business it is to teach. It is not so much arrogance which is the fault of the expert. Very often the expert has a very limited mind. He looks at only one facet of things. If Christianity and the Catholic Church stands or falls, it must be on the

belief that there is something more than human 'expertise' in our religion".

Bishop Lucey explained the manner in which "experts" had influenced the Council. He felt that Vatican II had not been businesslike enough and that there was not sufficient discussion.

"The Council itself did not have so much discussion as prepared addresses. The result was that issues raised by different speakers were *not* as a rule dealt with by later speakers because all the contributions were prepared".

The Bishop stressed that certain "hierarchies came to the Council knowing what they wanted and having prepared a way to get it, others came feeling their way".

MATER ECCLESIA

Is this my Mother, aged and careworn ?
Wrinkle riddled, raddled with the rouge
Of the "spirit" of Vatican two.
Pale eyed and downcast.
Not the eyes of Peter as he raced
Towards an empty tomb.
Not those of John, alight with love
For Christ his Lord.
Not the martyrs awaiting clear eyed
Their meeting with the Master.
The Family a bedlam of voices
Crying crazy contradictions.
Authority too timorous to speak;
Or make its voice heard above the din.
Thou art Peter,
Then come to me across the raging sea.
Soon dawn will break.
Rouse the sleeping Shepherds,
Prone in Gethsemane's garden.
That once more my Beloved
May shine like a young bride,
Arrayed for Christ her Lord.

Father Joseph Brown

In this second letter-article, Father Crane questions the assumption on which "A Time for Building" appears to be based; viz., that renewal in the form of external change was the will of the Fathers at Vatican II and that, in so willing, they could not have erred, for they were inspired by the Holy Spirit to call for this kind of renewal.

CURRENT COMMENT

Time for Building : A Commentary

2: BRICKS OUT OF STRAW

THE EDITOR

My Lord,

ONCE again, may I draw your kind attention to the irony of a situation in which — at a time when such stress is laid on the need for communication within the Church — I find it necessary, in order to get at what you are really thinking in this Report, to read constantly between its lines. I imagine others have had the same experience.

Goodies and Baddies

If I may say so, the prose of your Report is set within generalities and is, in consequence, so vague that, in order to discover its true meaning — still more, the message it contains — one has to search all the time for the implications contained within its sentences and the assumptions on which they rest. The process is intensely wearying. It is made no easier by the employment in your Report of what is best described, once again, as double-speak. By this I mean the assignment of identity of meaning to two words, each differing from the other, and, then, the employment

of either at random and in such a way that the particular meaning gratuitously assigned by yourself to each is finally hammered home in the mind of the reader in the form of an overpowering, if vague, impression. An example of the kind of double-speak I have in mind is provided in the first paragraph (19) of your opening chapter entitled, "A View of the Church in England and Wales since Vatican II". There we read in its third sentence: "Some wholeheartedly back renewal, others want renewal in some parts and a more traditional approach in others; some really desire to oppose all change". In other words, renewal appears as identified by your Committee with change; and of the sort that has been introduced into the Church since Vatican II, which committed the Church to renewal and, therefore, in your view, to change. Those, therefore, who resist change are, in your view, resisting renewal and, therefore, Vatican II which, in your view, called for renewal in the form of change throughout the Church. They, therefore, are the "Baddies" within the post-conciliar Church; the "Goodies" being those who move with the post-conciliar times, accepting change as it has been imposed by all sorts of authorities at all sorts of levels and in all sorts of forms throughout the Church in the wake of Vatican II and, as is said by way of justification, in its spirit. This would appear to be the implication lying behind almost every line of your Report, My Lord. It is, I regret to say nonsensical. This is so because the assumption on which it is made to rest is itself nonsensical.

A False Assumption

The first leg of this assumption is that the identification of renewal with change, which we have seen to be the fruit of double-speak, was willed by Vatican II and that—here is the second leg—in so willing, the Council Fathers cannot have erred, for they were directly inspired at the Council to call for renewal (i.e. change) by the Holy Spirit of God. From which it would seem to follow that Catholics are obliged to give their allegiance to post-conciliar change as the fruit of the Holy Spirit's original conciliar inspiration, and to post-conciliar orientations as favouring change (which, for you, is renewal) and setting its course. Change, in your view, is the post-conciliar task of the Church. You

have this set down in Chapter 3, paragraph 41, where you quote approvingly from *The Church 2000* :

"The Church exists as a sign that Christ is still present in the world. As it moves out into the world the Church becomes the instrument by which the redemption achieved by Christ is made available to all men. So the Church exists for the world and in the world. It is present in the world in order that the world may be changed".

One notes what appears to be the contrived ambiguity of this last sentence; but your real intention appears to be clear in the context of your mind as revealed throughout this Report. It is to impose change on the Church in the name of renewal. This, I have to say, is quite wrong because the assumption on which you rest your case is mistaken. In evidence, let me go back to a consideration of its second leg (which will, in fact, cover its first as well).

Vatican II not Directly Inspired

The point we have to inquire into is whether the Holy Spirit of God directly inspired the Council Fathers to call for renewal identified as change (externally, that is, in the practical expression of the Church's life and worship and the direction of its disciplinary and evangelising effort; but not internally as when, for example, the prayer of a Catholic is changed because deepened through increased holiness). What, then, of the view that the Holy Spirit of God directly inspired the Fathers of the Second Vatican Council? Theologically speaking, I am afraid this is simply not true. The confusion leading to this false belief — and the equally false conclusion that every post-conciliar change commands total obedience — is, to no small extent, largely a matter of words. Whether the words have been used deliberately in quarters within the Church to create the confusion on whose basis unquestioning obedience may be commanded, is a matter for investigation. I believe, personally, that they have been so used in many cases; but we will not discuss them here. My concern in this letter is with the work of the Holy Spirit during the Second Vatican Council, which was as true and legitimate as any of its predecessors and exceeded them all in the number of those present at its sessions. Neither can anyone deny for a single

moment that the Fathers at the Second Vatican Council enjoyed the PARTICULAR and SPECIAL help of the Holy Spirit of God, promised by Christ for the guidance of His Church on such extraordinary and solemn occasions. This much is theologically certain. At the same time, however, it has to be noticed very carefully that the form taken by this PARTICULAR assistance given by the Holy Spirit was not that of direct and positive INSPIRATION of the sort given only to the Apostles to meet the needs of the just-founded Church and which rendered the teaching of each infallible and their decisions sinless and holy. This gift given to them was a once-only.

Grace for the Taking

The help given by the Holy Spirit to the Fathers at the Second Vatican Council, as in the case of its predecessors, was not POSITIVE and DIRECT — not in the form of a personal charism with which each was endowed — but essentially AUXILIARY and NEGATIVE — in this sense, that they were prevented from making the kind of once-for-all statement in matters of Faith and Morals that would substitute and define error for truth absolutely and irreformably. This they were prevented from doing by the Holy Spirit of God and, in fact and of course, no such erroneous definitions were made. More particularly, where particular pastoral decisions and related points of doctrinal teaching were concerned, the assistance of the Holy Spirit was their's for the taking during Vatican II by each and all of the assembled Fathers, if I may put it that way. But it had to be taken; the Fathers, in other words, had to co-operate with Grace. This was on tap, so to say, but the tap had to be turned on by the co-operation of each; and this, of course, means prayer and prayerful pondering — lots of both. For there is nothing automatic about the working of this kind of Grace — *no ex opere operato* about it; it does not come like a shot in the arm and, even for this, you have to dispose your arm correctly. The reason is clear — God works through the co-operation of His creatures because he respects always their dignity as human beings. The point is that, to be effective, Grace has to be worked for, as is always the case, by Fathers in Council as well as by anyone else and this means, as a rule, on your

knees. There is nothing extraordinary about this. God, as I have just said, respects our human dignity when He works with and for us. He works through it, in co-operation with it, never round it or in spite of it; which means that our part is that of mind and heart and will turn towards Him; co-operating with His Grace, as the saying has it.

Was it Taken?

Was this so at the Council? Did the Fathers play their part to the full, so that each one of the Council's decisions, express or implied — and outside those areas covered by the preventive action of the Holy Spirit already referred to, which prevented them from substituting truth for error, but not automatically from making particular errors — may be said to have been made with that same Spirit's co-operative assistance, granted in answer to persistent prayer? I think there is good reason to doubt this. I cannot, for example, see the Holy Spirit at work, at the very outset of the Council, in the *coup* by which the Rhine Group of Fathers, as they came to be called, threw out the carefully prepared original schemata and then so fixed things that the Council's Commissions — and, thus, the proceedings of the Council — were dominated and controlled by Progressives of their own choosing from previously prepared lists, as was undoubtedly the case and as Father Wiltgen narrates in his scholarly book, *The Rhine Flows into the Tiber*. Neither can I discern the Spirit's gentle compelling presence in the manoeuvres undertaken to exclude any condemnation of Communism from the Council's proceedings. Nor in the cruel laughter and derisive applause, which followed the brutal cutting off of Cardinal Ottaviani — old and half-blind — in the middle of what he had to say on a vital question very early on in the Council's proceedings. I doubt, too, whether the Holy Spirit presided over those occasions, of which there were many, when certain Periti (experts), as they were called, sought to condition the Fathers outside the Council sessions into acceptance of the new theology and the new ways, both of which were thought up by the new theological establishment from which the Periti themselves were mostly drawn and which has sought ever since to impose its own teaching authority on the Church as a whole, often in defiance of the express

wishes of the Holy Father himself. Neither do I think that the Holy Spirit of God would have been particularly at ease with the late-night discussions and partying that went on when the day's work was done and progressive Bishops and Periti held court for their admirers and hangers-on. I have read a good deal about these and I do not like what I have read. The impression conveyed is one of overweening arrogance in an almost wholly secularised atmosphere. Against this background, which could be extended, I have often wondered how hard the Council Fathers prayed during its course — in private, I mean; as distinct from those great and magnificent occasions when they came together to worship God at Mass each morning. I often wonder about this.

Unconditional Adherence to Vatican II not Required

In the light of what has just been written, I think we can say correctly and in no spirit of defiance at all, but as a matter of truth, that Catholics are under no obligation to believe that particular conciliar decisions were automatically assisted by the Holy Spirit and can be claimed justly, in consequence, to be His work. From which it would seem to follow very logically that Catholics are under no obligation to give unconditional and unquestioning adherence to particular points of the Council's pastoral decisions and relevant points of doctrinal teaching. Still less are they required to adhere without question and automatically to a particular interpretation of the Council's message, such as yours, when you state (para. 20) that the Council has committed the Church "to a policy of renewal (meaning change) and reconciliation". And still less again are they committed to points of doctrinal teaching and pastoral policy said, as a result of supposed group-insight, to be "in the spirit of Vatican II". Unquestioning obedience cannot be commanded in the Council's name, nor a particular programme of renewal and reform imposed by its authority. The reason for this is twofold. In the first place, the Council deliberately refrained by its own choice from solemnly dogmatic definitions of Faith and Morals, which would have been, thereby, infallible and irreformable and which would have commanded unquestioning obedience. It chose not to do this and, in so doing, differed profoundly

from Vatican I, for example, Trent and so on. As a result of this decision the very special, preventive help provided by the Holy Spirit in these matters was not provided. What was provided by the Holy Spirit — laid on you might say — was undoubtedly a special assistance in the making of particular pastoral decisions and dealing with points of doctrinal teaching relevant to those decisions; but, as noted above, the Council Fathers had to co-operate with this special Grace that was undoubtedly offered and what we do not know is the extent to which this co-operation was given. In the absence of any real certainty on this point, it follows that the nature and extent of the Council's authority is indeterminate because the extent to which the Holy Spirit was present in its pastoral decisions and doctrinal teaching is unknown. Catholics, therefore, cannot be bound to a "blanket" acceptance of the Council's authority because neither they nor anyone else can be bound absolutely by the unknown. To attempt to compel them so to bind themselves would appear to be tyranny. Yet this is what you seem to me to attempt in your Report. I am forced, in consequence, from this angle at least, to describe your Report as tyrannical.

Tradition the Criterion

Because of the circumstances described above, which are put forward in a spirit, not of defiance, but of truth, the only course open to Catholics is to examine the Council's pastoral directives and relevant points of doctrinal teaching with a view to discovering whether or not they accord with the traditional and infallible (by reason of its ordinary Magisterium) teaching of the Church. To those that do they must give their unquestioning adherence. Of those that do not this is not required. In other words, the approach of Catholics to the Council's pastoral decisions and relevant doctrinal teaching, though always respectful, must be discriminating, which is the opposite of that blanket-acceptance against which I have argued in this article and which so often appears to be demanded with such lack of compassion and with such injustice by what might be described as the new Progressive Establishment of what is now called, in some quarters, the Post-conciliar

Church and to which you, My Lord and your Committee, would appear to belong.

Confirmed by Pope Paul

Those who will feel inclined, at this stage of this letter of mine, to accuse me of disobedience and disloyalty to the Holy Father and to the Council will be interested to learn that the views here expressed have received the support of Pope Paul in several of his public pronouncements; as, for example, in his Closing Address to the Council, his General Audience of January 12th, 1966 and that of August 6th, 1975, when he stated: "The first Constitution issued by the Council was its pronouncement on the sacred Liturgy. This legislation endowed the Council itself with its aspect of renewal, for, differing from other Councils, this one was not directly dogmatic, but doctrinal and pastoral". In parenthesis, as it were, we should notice that the Holy Father could not but stress that Vatican II was not "directly dogmatic", for, if it had been, it would have been concerned with infallible and irreformable dogmatic definitions. In other words, and of set choice, Vatican II, unlike its predecessors, was not concerned with the promulgation of infallible dogmatic definitions, which Catholics would be bound to accept and to which they would have to accord unquestioning obedience. Disclaimers of this intention are absolutely clear from the words of Pope John in his Opening Address to the Council and Pope Paul in that which closed it. More specifically perhaps, the mind of the present Pope is revealed by Jean Guilton, his friend, in his book, *Dialogues with Pope Paul*, where the Holy Father is quoted as saying:

"Former Councils were the work of theologians who were above all preoccupied with giving a doctrinal lesson . . . resumed in definitions . . . made precise by anathemas . . . But this Council had a different aim: it was primarily pastoral, cordial, communicative, seeking dialogue between the Church and the world, seeking application, response rather than reasoning, and, I would dare to say, ministerium rather than magisterium (a play on words, rendered in the French, le ministère plus que le magistère)".

I see no reason now for labouring this point. The conclusion is clear enough. The Council texts by express wish of Popes John and Paul contain no solemnly defined and, therefore, infallible and irreformable points of doctrine. From this it follows that the pastoral decisions and related points of doctrine which it does contain can command unqualified assent only to the extent that they accord with the ordinary (as distinct from the solemn and extraordinary) and infallible teaching authority of the Church. This is made clear in the "Explanatory Note" of Archbishop (now Cardinal) Felici, Secretary-General of the Council, on November 16th, 1964. I think I had better quote it. It runs as follows :

"A query has been made as to what is the theological qualification to be attached to the teaching put forward in the schema, The Church, on which a vote is to be taken.

"The Doctrinal Commission has replied to this query in appraising the *modi* proposed to the third chapter of the schema, The Church :

"'As is self-evident, the conciliar text is to be interpreted in accordance with the general rules which are known to all.'

"On this occasion the Doctrinal Commission referred to its Declaration of March 6th, 1964, which we reproduce here :

"'Taking into account conciliar practice and the pastoral purpose of the present Council, the sacred synod defined as binding on the Church only those matters of faith and morals which it has expressly put forward as such.

"'Whatever else it proposes as the teaching of the supreme magisterium of the Church is to be acknowledged and accepted by each and every member of the faithful according to the mind of the Council which is clear from the subject matter and its formulation, following the norms of theological interpretation'."

It is precisely these norms of theological interpretation that I have tried to follow in my explanation given above and in view of the fact that none of the documents of Vatican II were backed by the Church's infallible teaching authority, as the Holy Father made clear when he said, in his General

Audience of January 12th, 1966, "In view of the pastoral nature of the Council, it has avoided pronouncing in an extraordinary way dogmas carrying the note of infallibility".

Cardinals Garrone and Felici

That there is room for the legitimate and necessary kind of interpretation called for by the Council's Doctrinal Commission is apparent from what appears at times as the ambiguity and vagueness of a good many points of pastoral practice and related doctrinal teaching in the conciliar texts themselves. For most Catholics, I think it correct to say, their meaning is not clear at a first—or, indeed, any—reading. "There are indeed", said Archbishop (now Cardinal) Felici, Secretary-General of the Council, "many terms of doubtful meaning in the Council's texts". And Cardinal Garrone, in his book, *Concile Oecumenique Vatican 2*, points out that many of the Council Fathers were irritated by the continued insistence that the Council was pastoral, but in terms so ill-defined that the expression was regarded as "a pretext for imprudence and imprecision of language". With determinedly progressive Bishops in charge of the Council's Commissions — and with Periti of like mind at their side — this is hardly to be wondered at. More than ever, in consequence, does it appear as necessary to appraise the conciliar texts in accordance with their conformity with the ordinary and infallible traditional teaching of the Church.

The Ordinary and Infallible Magisterium

In this context, it seems wise to add a note on what the ordinary and infallible Magisterium (teaching authority) of the Church is; and, as is my habit in such cases, I rely, in so doing, on an opinion of much greater worth than I could possibly provide. The point I wish to emphasize is that which has been running through this letter. It is that the conciliar texts of Vatican II, in so far as they contain pastoral decisions and related points of doctrinal teaching, cannot, of themselves, command unquestioning and blanket adherence from Catholics, but only in so far as they are seen as — and, hopefully, pronounced by Supreme Authority in the Church to be — part of the ordinary magisterium (traditional and infallible teaching) of the Church; in which case they would enjoy its infallibility and demand the un-

questioning adherence of all Catholics. Dom Paul Nau has defined and described this infallibility of the Church's ordinary magisterium as clearly as anyone I know :

"The infallibility of the ordinary magisterium is not that of a judgment, nor that of an act to be considered in isolation, as if it could itself provide all the light necessary. It is that of the guarantee given to a doctrine by the simultaneous or continuous convergence of a plurality of affirmations or explanations, none of which, taken by itself, can bring definitive certitude. Certitude can be expected only from the whole complex."⁽¹⁾

- (1) Cf. *The Ordinary Magisterium of the Church Theologically Considered*. Published by "Approaches", 1 Waverley Place, Saltcoats, Ayrshire KA21 5AX.

From this it follows that the conciliar texts in general and with regard to particular points of pastoral practice and related doctrinal teaching, are not irreformable; their teaching has to be compared to the traditional teaching of the Church given in previous texts of its Magisterium or Teaching Authority. Where they accord with the traditional teaching, unquestioning obedience has to be given. Where they depart from it, then there is need for rectification.

Bricks out of Straw

The implication here is that the examination of the conciliar texts by competent ecclesiastical authority is essential. Until this is done, Catholics are under obligation, indeed, to treat them with great respect, but not to give them blanket-acceptance as they stand. Those, therefore, who insist that Catholics should accept these texts blindly, out of a misguided sense of loyalty or in the interests of imposing on the laity their own version of what the Church should be in the name of conciliar renewal (which for them, so often, means no more than rootless change) appear as guilty of an outsize confidence trick in the service of what amounts to petty tyranny of the worst kind. Metaphorically speaking, the wretched Catholic laity today, like the wretched Israelites before them in the land of Egypt, are

being pressurised by post-conciliar commissions, committees and progressive clerics and religious to build the bricks of supposed renewal out of the straw of conciliar decisions whose strength, significance and true authority remain, in so many cases, as yet unknown. I am quite sure, myself, that the real object of the exercise in very many cases is not to renew the Old Church, but to build a new one in its stead on the basis of what amounts to a secularised anti-faith and to impose it on the Faithful by what amounts in so many cases to sleight of hand. This intention, however subconsciously held, is easily discernible in the pages of your Report. You talk therein, for example, of democracy. But your real intention, consciously or subconsciously, is to make use of democratic centralism in the name of supposedly true democracy (which does not belong to the Church anyway) to impose on the Church, in the name of true renewal, secularised and rootless change. This intention appears — positively and by omission; expressly and by implication — from between the lines of the pages of your Report. Only the naively unsuspecting could miss it: and, whatever else I may be, I am not amongst their number.

Report's Bogus Intention Rejected

In the light of the analysis contained in this letter, which I suggest is theologically sound, I have to inform you and your Committee, My Lord, that I will have none of the intention which is so obviously yours in the pages of your Report. Like so much else that issues from semi-official sources in the Church today it is, I am afraid, bogus to the nth degree and your attempt to give it concrete expression in the life of the Church in this country in the not-too-distant future, smacks of petty tyranny. For your Report rests, as I hope I have demonstrated in this letter to yourself, on the false assumption that the conciliar texts and the so-called post-conciliar reforms emerging from them demand unquestioning and absolute adherence as they stand. The assumption, I am afraid, is futile. Having shown it to be such I am forced to the conclusion that your Report, which is based on it, can only merit the same condemnation.

(To be concluded)

"A Time For Building"

(Comments by Pro Fide, national Catholic Lay Movement)

PRO Fide is deeply concerned that this new Report, following as it does the *Church 2000* document and presumably attempting to include the ideas and thoughts produced by Catholics in England and Wales as a result of the discussions on that document, does not appear to voice what clearly emerged as the majority view. In his *Response to Church 2000* the Rev. Mr. David Miles Board admitted that of the (admittedly tiny) number of letters received, a large proportion put forward what he called the "Conservationist" view; i.e., one which supported the traditional teachings of the Church and her present methods and structures. In fact, a total of 403 replies were received and there were 400 signatures of one particular "Conservationist" petition.

Totally disregarding these views however (which in all fairness it is perfectly entitled to do, since there was never any commitment to act as if the Church were some secular democratic body dependent for its policy on a consensus or majority decision) *A Time for Building* goes much further than ever *Church 2000* did. It advocates married priests, hints at the ordination of women ("In view of what we said in *The Church 2000* about the permanent diaconate, we feel serious consideration should be given to the practical and theological possibility of ordaining women to *this and other ministries*"), urges the removal of the parish structure (although it says that churches would still have a use as centres for aid to underdeveloped countries and also for weddings and funerals), and calls for the immediate setting up of small groups "on the basis of, for example, shared interests, professions, neighbourhoods", each with its "eucharistic leader" who must "ideally emerge from within the group". (It is not clear whether or not this leader will be a priest.)

Pro Fide expresses the view that this vision of the Church is a vague, unhelpful one at this time of crisis.

Young people—who today are leaving the Church in such large numbers and not returning, as is sometimes hopefully expected, after their teen years — will not be attracted to joining one of several small groups of people who share a profession or interest (all the factory workers in one group, all the lawyers, doctors, and teachers in another?). Seeking the presence of God in the Blessed Sacrament they will not be impressed to find in their Parish Church a centre for aid to the Third World, which is also occasionally used for public festivals. Seeing the problems and challenges of modern society, they are not going to be impressed with a report that hardly seems to be talking about modern Britain at all: in its opening comments on “The General Ethos of Society” there is no mention of trades unions, recent drastic changes in educational trends and structures, the swiftly-changing international scene, or the emergence of “permissive” moral standards — most peculiar omissions, especially when the report *does* comment on such trivia as the recycling of waste material practised by some conservation groups.

Given the Holy Father’s clear statements on the ordination of women, the equivocal tone of the Report is irritating, and unjust to its readers. Catholics have a right to know that there is in fact a whole set of serious theological and Biblical reasons against the ordination of women, some of which were quoted in the Pope’s recent correspondence with the Archbishop of Canterbury. Omission of any reference to this in the Report is misleading and unfair.

The concept of “Eucharistic leaders” is puzzling, especially as they are described thus: “Leaders of Christian communities will be recognised by the Bishop, *some by priestly ordination*” (our emphasis). Since it goes on to describe how each leader will be “Eucharistic president” in his own group, Pro Fide feels that some explanation is called for. Presumably it doesn’t mean that men and women who have not been ordained to the priesthood but who emerge as “leaders of groups” will “say” Mass? Clarification is urgently needed here.

In its investigations both among its members (Pro Fide is a national organisation whose members are Catholics of all ages representing a wide variety of walks of life, includ-

ing a flourishing Teachers Guild) and among other Catholics, Pro Fide has found mixed views on this Report. Most Catholics have simply never heard of it. Among Pro Fide members (who tend to be people active within the Church who make a point of keeping themselves up to date with whatever is going on) there was grave concern as to its implications. We are appalled at the idea of a "National Pastoral Council", especially in view of what happened to the Church in Holland following such a Council in that country. In general terms, we feel that what the Church in our country needs today is a reaffirmation of its authentic teaching, especially in schools where there is evidence of slipshod catechetics often missing out vital aspects of doctrine; an emphasis on the spiritual as opposed to the practical and material (this plea comes especially from the young, who today complain that "church" means folk music and friendliness, with coffee and a chat afterwards — all of which can be obtained elsewhere); and a reassurance of no more major liturgical, pastoral or structural changes so that the events of the past decade can be gradually assimilated and a period of real growth can begin to make good the tragic losses from the priesthood, religious life, and active lay apostolate that have marked the previous few years.

Finally, we assert that the role of the Church is to be missionary and as such outward-looking, emphatic in its message, and forward-looking. We found *A Time for Building* depressingly introspective and narrow in its outlook. We believe that the Church has magnificent opportunities for mission in our country today, offering men and women a vision of Truth and Hope at a time of confusion and disillusionment.

"The two opposing camps are now clearly marked; each man should choose his own. Men of good will and men of evil will face one another. The uninterested and the cowards face their fearsome responsibility. They will have their names changed if they do not change their behaviour: they will be called traitors." — Pope Pius XI.

A Bishop to His Brother Bishops

(Civiltà Cristiana, anno 4, n. 11)

ARCHBISHOP ARRIGO PINTONELLO

SOME time ago, in these columns, we asserted that even in Italy there were Pastors who, concerned about the serious crisis which has overtaken the postconciliar Church, were determined in some way to find a remedy. The Italian press reported the news, but a certain daily was sceptical—it was unthinkable that Italian bishops, forced by compelling pressures and by techniques of conditioning to limit their pastoral activity, could have the will and the courage to denounce and withstand the auto-destruction of the Church which has now been going on for some time and the results of which are evident to all; so that even Paul VI himself has been induced to talk of "the smoke of Satan" which is filtering through the cracks.

Today we are in a position to confirm our assertion with facts.

Italy still has holy and virtuous bishops, consistent and courageous, disinterested and large-hearted; and we could make a list of several of them with whom we have often spoken, prayed and suffered, in union of love for Church and country. We think it helpful to make known the mind of one in particular, His Grace Archbishop Arrigo Pintonello, the Italian Army Bishop Emeritus. He is not, as you

might think from the title "Emeritus", an aged Prelate. Mgr. Pintonello is vigorous, intelligent, experienced, a man of faith, who fulfils his own vocation in charitable and cultural activities.

It seems, therefore, important to give publicity to the lucid and logical analysis of the evils in the Church which Archbishop Pintonello makes in his letter addressed to the whole Italian episcopate. We offer it for consideration by our friends, just as, in the sub-title of our article, we have reminded them of the words with which the *Osservatore Romano* commented on Pius XI's Encyclical on Atheistic Communism, *Divini Redemptoris* on 19 March 1937, when its speech had the Gospel firmness of Yea and Nay.

Now, after years in the trough of the waves, with no light but our faith in the final promise, we rejoice, naturally as well as supernaturally, in the comfort brought us by a Pastor who has not abandoned his flock to the ravening wolves.

To their Excellencies the Bishops

We address this appeal, asking them to devote a little time and attention not only to the usual social projects but also to the following reasons for considering the present dramatic situation and coming to opportune and urgent pastoral decisions.

We should like their Excellencies the Bishops to reflect above all on :

Precisions :

- * LIBERTY, understood as : moral permissiveness, justified with an appeal to the rights of the human person; doctrinal pluralism, which violates the "aliis atque aliis verbis eadem dicere, non alia dicere" (in these words and those words to say the same, not different, things) of Saint Augustine and damages the unity and unicity of the message of salvation; uncritical and anti-historical reformism separated from the genuine principles of "Ecclesia semper reformanda" in the fields of liturgy, apostolate, discipline and seminaries.
- * DIALOGUE, reduced to : a specious excuse for all kinds of confrontation; the loss of the specific Christian-Catholic identity; an alarming and progressive abandonment

of religious allegiance; relativization of truth and the possession of it; concessions to democracy by the Church and her government, with a corresponding promotion of parliamentary-style assemblies.

■ **ECUMENISM**, practised as: abandonment of the boundaries between the Church and every other religion; in practice, the exposure of Christians to materialistic ideologies; the hand outstretched to Communism with a cynical and guilty silence on the horrors of the mutilation of the Church and those of the Siberian camps.

■ **THE IDENTITY OF THE CATHOLIC RELIGION** compromised by the insertion of Protestant forms and elements, and its reduction to a simple mode of a universal religion.

* **THE CHURCH DEBASED** to the status of a sort of political organization to the extent that she has lost sight of her supernatural purpose or has subordinated it to a futile desire for social betterment.

■ **THE FIGURE OF THE ROMAN PONTIFF** given new theological dimensions and, not always peacefully, become an ordinary Head of State, and not infrequently made ridiculous through having in too many ways lost the meaning and the measure of his specific ecclesial service.

■ **THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH**, at least in appearance, more obedient to the spasmodic anxiety to keep in step with the more forceful forms of democracy than to the practical interests of souls; and, for all its enthusiasm for democracy, often transformed into an oligarchy which does not stop short of absolute despotism.

■ **THE REALITY OF THE CHURCH**, doctrinal, liturgical and pastoral, and still more the very life of the nations, withdrawn from the responsible dogmatic and moral watchfulness and the apostolic solicitude of true Pastors by the force of a misunderstood liberty and as a result of mindless dialogue, undisciplined ecumenism and false irenism.

* **CHRISTIAN ASCETICISM**, in honour for centuries and proved by holiness, even heroic, now emptied of its Gospel content, self-denial and sacrifice, which have given place to the rights of the human person.

* **SEMINARIES AND CONVENTS**, in great part deser-

ted, closed or abandoned, and schools of theology, whether in seminaries or universities, often turned into chairs of heresy and doctrinal deviation.

- * THE "NEW PRIESTS", disguised, and identified with the crowd, without the priestly dress which distinguishes the "man of God" (2 Tim. 3. 17), and manifestly assimilated to the world and its standards.
- * THE PEOPLE systematically fobbed off, in their expectation of evangelization, with an anti-instructive and not infrequently anti-theological catechetics.
- * FINALLY, THE GENERAL DESCENT of the nations into atheism, the tragic background about which the silence of those who should speak but keep silent takes on the appearance of an open defiance of the continually renewed condemnation of atheistic materialism by Pius IX, Leo XIII, Saint Pius X, Pius XI and Pius XII.

Petitions

- * That a stop be put to the orgy of theological pluralism which hides a deplorable basic indifferentism; to moral permissiveness, to indiscriminate ecumenism and to unreflecting irenism.
- * That the doors be closed against Marxism and that its condemnation be renewed—there are centres of lay culture, not, therefore to be thought prejudiced, which assert that Marxism is incompatible with Christianity.
- * That seminaries be reformed in accordance with the strict constitutions of Trent and the sound modernization of Vatican II.
- * That teachers and superiors of seminaries who propagate errors and heresies be dismissed.
- * That a healthy and holy clergy be formed, restored to the "apostolica vivendi forma".
- * That the people be catechized from the catechism of Saint Pius X with just the necessary adaptation to existing religious, moral and social conditions.
- * That a barrier be erected against the dreadful flood of immorality.
- * That youth be saved from being the defenceless prey of unscrupulous corrupters.
- * That a firm Gospel Yea and Nay be said on the great problems of social and religious life, and that there be no

more of the detestable tortuosity of diplomatic dissembling and political compromise.

- * That the urgencies of the social problem be answered without putting them in front of, or contrary to, the primacy of salvation.
- * That there be a call for the reinstatement, with the full range of their competence, of the Supreme Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office and of the three Commissions, Biblical, Theological and for the Interpretation of Vatican II, before we sink to the depths of doctrinal, disciplinary and pastoral chaos.
- * That candidates be proposed for the episcopate who are endowed with apostolic courage and sound theological culture.
- * In short, that firmly and swiftly (cf. yesterday, legalized divorce; today, legalized abortion) the power of the Keys be exercised as Christ exercised it, as it was exercised by the Bishops in the course of the centuries, in collegial form but also individually, but never making it conditional on the approbation of the so-called bases, that is, of the laity and the clergy.

Questions

- * Is all that pessimism? Certainly it could be; but our "black" view of things is shared in written judgements of hundreds and hundreds of priests, bishops and laity.
- * Interference in the business of the Bishops? We should say, rather, that this initiative, although, modest and humble, is a full recognition of episcopal competence. We know what are the "sacri munera episcopatus"; we regard them with the eyes of faith, and from their firm exercise we await, if not the solution, at least a serious and coherent effort to resolve the complicated problems of the Church today.
- * Is ours a voice in the desert? (as was said by the Editor of the most important Italian Review of ascetical and mystical theology). We could be tempted to think it is; but we have confidence in the sense of apostolic responsibility of our Pastors, and we should like to hope that the wall of their silence will in the end be bravely demolished.

Salient Points

- * Never before have human beings had such a thirst for divine truth, and never before has it been so correspondingly scarce.
- * Never, as in our days, has there been such anarchy in the Church, and never such a corresponding lack of guidance by Pastors at all levels.
- * Never, as in our age, has the integrity of the "Deposit of Faith" been so much under attack, and never has the teaching Church been so silent and miserly in fulfilling its magisterial and pastoral mandate.
- * It is childish to take refuge in a pseudo-reason from faith, that God presides over the laws of history and will not abandon his people. That is historical fatalism.
- * It is grotesque to assert : yesterday the Church converted the barbarians, and today she will convert the atheists, the remote and the indifferent. History does not repeat itself.
- * It is reckless to hope : God will help. It is futile to hope in him when nothing is being done to call forth his assistance.

Conclusions

Errors and heresies, chaos and anarchy : truly a scourge of God more vast and widespread than Attila's, with consequences which should spoil the sleep of those responsible for the life and government of the Church; but all they do, inexplicably, is keep silent. Theological ignorance ? Love of the quiet life ? Concern for career ?

Brethern in the Episcopate

We hear every day the groans of distress and unrestrainable anguish of great numbers of priests and laity at the present universal confusion, dispersion and defection. In their name also we dare to say to you :

RENEW in us the joy of having been baptized into this Church which, confided to your care, is today unrecognizable, so greatly is she convulsed and subverted.

RESTORE her true countenance, her authentic Gospel features, her theological marks, in full conformity with your episcopal power and duty on which the Church herself is supported as on her pillar and to which the people of God look as to the ground of their own hope.

✠ Arrigo Pintonello
Archbishop

We are happy to publish details of the sufferings of two brave Christian confessors of the Russian Orthodox Church, one a priest and the other a layman. They and so many others like them should have our prayers.

Two Confessors of the Russian Orthodox Church

1: FATHER BORIS ZALIVAKO

BORN in 1940, Father Boris Zalivako is a Leningrader of Polish origin. He was deprived of the right to exercise his ministry in 1968, apparently for refusing to comply with the limitations placed on priests by the Soviet Government. With a friend, Father Boris Zalivako decided to leave the Soviet Union. They managed to cross the border into Czechoslovakia, but were captured and returned to Russia. His companion (Anatoly Chinnov) was confined to a psychiatric hospital from which he has recently been released. Father Boris Zalivako was sentenced to eight years of strict regime (the most arduous) followed by five years of exile.

Those who have shared imprisonment with him were profoundly impressed with his saintly life and character. Andrei Sinyavsky was one of them, and this is what he wrote about Father Boris:

"I can affirm that the escape abroad of which he was found guilty could not have stemmed from political motives. Least of all does this act fit with the juridical definition of 'particularly dangerous crimes against the State', with which he was charged.

"He was the very incarnation of a priest, he lived only for his faith and for his prayer. After coming to our camp Father Boris became the camp priest in the fullest sense of

the word. I have not met such a man before: he fulfilled all the obligations and ritual duties of a priest with complete devotion amid the highly oppressive and sometimes unbearable camp conditions. He would hold services beneath the open sky at night, in rain or snow, and for our entire camp he soon became an outstanding example of Christian service to God and his fellow men.

"Father Boris scarcely ever discussed trivial or worldly matters and he spoke about himself even less frequently. Every free minute after the exhausting work-day was given over to his mission as camp priest".

In Soviet labour camps even the Gospels are prohibited and hand-written copies of prayers are periodically confiscated during individual and mass searches. Father Boris's life and work quickly aroused the displeasure of the camp authorities. His influence over the other prisoners was entirely undesirable from their point of view.

In 1971 he was sent to the closed prison of Vladimir for three years. Incarceration in this institution is regarded as a harsher measure of punishment than all the camp "regimes": the prison differs from the camps by imposing even severer living conditions and still greater deprivations on its inmates.

Other prisoners have described Father Boris as follows:

"Father Boris had won general respect by his tranquillity and gentleness. Those who are accustomed to live in conformity with baseness (*podlost*) could not but fear his firmness and lack of compromise with his convictions and conscience, his inescapable influence on those around him".

The Vladimir prison has reduced Father Boris Zalivako, a physically healthy and rather young man to such a state of physical debility that there is now every reason to fear for his life. After an operation for appendicitis which he underwent in prison, the wound did not heal: such was the extent to which the tissues of his body had been sapped of their vitality. The latest information is that his situation is extremely grave and that he has asked recently released prisoners to arrange for a priest to be permitted to visit him. So far complaints to this end have remained unanswered.

Can we, in our comfortable freedom, ignore the suffering of such a courageous and exemplary man?

2: VLADIMIR OSIPOV

Layman: Writer and Editor

THE writer and editor Vladimir Osipov, 37, was sentenced on 26th September 1975 to eight years in a labour camp on a charge of anti-Soviet activities. Western correspondents who attempted to attend his trial were barred from the courtroom by police who told them it was an internal matter.

Osipov was arrested on 28th November 1974, and was detained before trial for longer than the nine months stipulated by Soviet law. At first he was held in the notorious Vladimir prison. On 31st March 1975 it was reported that he had been transferred to the also notorious Serbsky Institute for Forensic Psychiatry, in Moscow, for pre-trial investigation.

Until recently Osipov, a Russian Orthodox layman, was the editor of *Veche* (the word means a popular assembly in Russian medieval towns), a journal with a nationalist and religious line. At the age of 20 he was expelled from the History Department of Moscow University for publicly defending a friend who had been expelled. In 1961 he was imprisoned for "anti-Soviet activity" following his involvement with a journal which published the work of young writers and poets. After serving a sentence of seven years he was exiled from Moscow and only with difficulty was able to find work and accommodation. He commented that life in prison camp was easier than dealing with the cynicism and indifference of the authorities. He and his wife settled in Alexandrov, "in a muddy, roadless waste, without school, hospital, transport or telephone".

He began again to write and edit unofficial publications supporting many well-known Soviet dissidents. In several documents written in 1974 Osipov supported the ideas expressed by Alexander Solzhenitsyn in his *Letter to the Soviet Leaders*. Contributors to the publication included I. R. Shafarevich, A. E. Levitin-Krasnov (his essay on the priest Dmitri Dudko's "Talks"), Mashkova and Ratmirov.

Osipov's wife, Valentina Mashkova, and their children are all familiar with the hardships of Soviet persecution.

Valentina has spent a total of eleven years in political prison camps. Her first child was born in prison, and throughout and after her second pregnancy she was continually harassed by the K.G.B. A qualified teacher in mathematics, the only work she could find following their exile was guarding allotments. The hut in which she lived was over a mile from the nearest neighbour and about three miles from the nearest school. Her seven-year old daughter had therefore to live with her grandmother over two thousand miles away. The police had threatened her with deprivation of parental rights.

Osipov's arrest has called forth a wave of protest in the U.S.S.R. and abroad. Among prominent members of the Democratic Movement in the Soviet Union who have appealed for his release are Shafarevich, Agursky, Grigorenko, Tverdokhlebov and Levitin. Three Western Orthodox hierarchs have also spoken out in his defence: Metropolitan Philaret of the Russian Orthodox Church in Exile, Metropolitan Ireney of the Orthodox Church in America, and Archbishop Iakovos of the Greek Orthodox Archbishopric in North and South America.

Despite the continued persecution by the Soviet Government, Osipov remains intransigently loyal to the Government and this he has repeatedly stressed in his publications. Those who have been working for his release frequently point out that neither the journal which Osipov formerly edited, nor the articles which he has written, could be regarded, even by Soviet law, as criminal. The case of the Osipovs and their loyal opposition clearly cannot be ignored by any discussion of the realities behind detente negotiations.

The final word about the effectiveness of the Soviet policy of repression of free thought should be given to Vladimir Osipov himself:

"Not without reason is a concentration camp officially called a corrective colony. They come in atheists and go out Christians. They have been *corrected* . . . The camp made me a man believing in God, in Russia and in the legacy of my forefathers".

**"We believe that the Mass, which is celebrated by the priest in the person of Christ in virtue of the power he receives in the Sacrament of Order, and which is offered by him in the name of Christ and of the members of his Mystical Body, is indeed the Sacrifice of Calvary realized on our altars"—
Pope Paul VI, *Credo of the People of God*,
30 June, 1968.**

The Sacrifice of the Mass: Liturgy and Theology

W. J. MORGAN

AS "the summit, we may also say the centre, of the Christian religion is the Mystery of the Most Holy Eucharist" (Pius XII, *Mediator Dei*, 1947, para. 20), it is but to be expected that the witness against the false Reform of the Church, which favours Protestantism and Modernism, should centre on maintaining the traditional Roman Rite of the Mass. Yet that which most scandalises those Catholics who cannot believe the evidence of their eyes and ears, is the witness of traditionalist Catholics that the New Order of Mass, promulgated by Pope Paul in 1969, represents a practical undermining of the doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass from within the structure of the Church. This horrific charge can be demonstrated — as has many times been shown — by examining the Missals of St. Pius V and Paul VI and noting how all the unambiguous references to the renewal of the Sacrifice of the Cross, which anticipate and recapitulate the Faith expressed in the Roman Canon, are absent in the latter; and how the new Canon II is totally vague and ambiguous on the matter.

Elimination of Offertory Prayers

The most obvious eliminations though not the only ones, are of the unambiguous offertory prayers: "*Suscipe, sancte*

Pater"; *Offerimus tibi, Domine*"; "*Veni, sanctificator*", and "*Suscipe, sancta Trinitas*". The remaining "*In spiritu humilitatis*" and "*Orate fratres*" are now ambiguous as between the renewal of the Sacrifice of the Cross and the personal sacrifice of praise of the worshippers. This is confirmed by the fact that those two priestly prayers are found in the Good Friday "Mass of the Presanctified", where there is no consecration and thus no renewal of the Sacrifice of the Cross.

For those prayers which indubitably refer to the Sacrifice of Christ, Priest and Victim, are substituted, in the *Novus Ordo Missae*, prayers offering bread and wine, conforming to the Jewish table blessings, "*Benedictus es, Domine, Deus Universi*". In the Tridentine Mass, the "*immaculatam hostiam*" and "*calicem salutis*", which are offered for the sins of the living and the dead, are the body and blood of Christ, separated on Calvary; not the bread and wine which are to be transubstantiated into the glorified flesh and blood of the Ascended Christ. For this reason, certain orthodox but mystified writers have actually praised the new offertory rite as an improvement on the Tridentine! Thus the late Father John Flanagan, in the *ICPA Newsletter*, Vol. V, No. 2, 1975, tells his readers that a comparison of the two sets of offertory prayers shows that they are both "basically the same, but that of Pope Paul VI is more accurately expressed" (page 53)! Likewise, Mr. Christopher Derrick, writing in *Faith*, January/February 1976, claims: "I think we can properly see a theological improvement here, though I agree we have suffered a sad aesthetic loss"! What both these confused Catholics know is that what are on the altar until the consecration are bread and wine. What they fail to appreciate is what they are there as; *symbolically, already* the body and blood of Christ. During the action of offering the "host" and "chalice" at the Tridentine offertory, the priest says prayers of sacrificial offering, which all admit refer to the body and blood of Christ, not to bread and wine. In that sense critics and defenders of the Tridentine offertory rightly refer to it as "anticipatory"; the one group to discredit it, the other to defend it. But even the latter — so it seems to the writer — fail to notice that the elements are therefore symbols of Christ's

body and blood separated in death, and are to be consecrated as such.

Inadequate Theological Teaching

It is rather disconcerting to find a pre-conciliar liturgist, Canon M. S. MacMahon, in his fascinating *Liturgical Catechism* (third edition, 1930), commenting on the offertory prayers — and the prayers of the Canon prior to the consecration — as though they are prayers offering bread and wine. For instance, he says this about the first offertory prayer (page 105):

“In the first Oblation prayer (*‘Suscipe, sancte Pater’, ‘Receive, O Holy Father’*) the priest offers up the Host, that is, the bread, to the Eternal Father for his own sins, for all present, for all the living and the dead . . .” This is sheer nonsense. The good Canon is as aware as any of us, when he speaks as a teacher of Catholic truth, not as a liturgical commentator, that “the Sacrifice of the altar which is now about to be accomplished is the same as the Sacrifice of the Cross” (page 113). He cannot therefore really believe that bread is offered for the sins of the living and the dead! What seems to be true of Canon MacMahon and other pre-Vatican II writers is that they often had a most inadequate *theology* of the Sacrifice of the Mass (even though, of course, their faith in the Catholic dogma is beyond question); and their thinking, like Mr. Christopher Derrick in his *Faith* article, is so preoccupied with the fact of transubstantiation itself, that they do not go on to relate transubstantiation to the Eucharistic Sacrifice. If one’s concern is to teach transubstantiation, one will emphasise that on the altar, until the consecration, are bread and wine, and that afterwards, by the total conversion of their substances, one has the body and blood of Christ, together with his soul and Divinity. If — as one should be in expounding the Mass prayers — one is primarily concerned with the Sacrifice being offered, one will give due attention to the symbolic role (prior to the consecration) of the bread and wine as signs of the body and blood of Christ separated in sacrificial death; which sacrifice one wishes to offer to God. In seeking to give a satisfactory theological account of the doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass, one necessarily

goes beyond the area of the dogmatic definitions of the Church, and even of her solemn ordinary teaching. Accordingly, there is room for free debate among Catholics, and room for mistaken reasoning. However, the attempt to expound the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice is an attempt to understand what we believe by the teaching of the Church ("*Fides quaeret intellectum*"). The attempt is in principle an act of worship of God, by which we use our intellects to appropriate what he has revealed to us.

Expounding True Doctrine

A first, negative point to be made in attempting to expound the doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass, is that it is most definitely *not* a sacrifice of bread and wine (notwithstanding ICEL's introduction into Eucharistic Prayer I of "the bread and wine offered by your priest Melchisedech"). The Council of Trent teaches us that it is Christ who is offered in an unbloody manner in the Mass (Session XXII, chapter 2). As Pope Paul summarises its teaching in the Encyclical *Mysterium Fidei* (1968): "by means of the Mystery of the Eucharist, the Sacrifice of the Cross, which was once offered on Calvary, is remarkably re-enacted and constantly recalled, and its saving power exerted for the forgiveness of those sins which we daily commit". Another point to emphasise — against Protestant and Agreed Statement teaching—is that, in Pius XII's words (*Mediator Dei*, 1947, para. 72): "The august Sacrifice of the altar is therefore no mere simple commemoration of the Passion and Death of Jesus Christ; it is truly and properly the offering of a sacrifice, wherein by an unbloody immolation the High Priest does what He had already done on the Cross, offering Himself to the Eternal Father as a most acceptable Victim".

This dogmatic teaching of Trent has been vigorously reasserted by all the Popes of modern times. Leo XIII, in *Apostolicae Curae* (1896), teaches that the "grace and power" of the Catholic priesthood is "pre-eminently the power 'to consecrate and offer the true body and blood of the Lord' in that sacrifice which is no 'mere commemoration of the sacrifice performed on the cross'". Pope John XXIII states: "There, at the altar, the priest, by virtue of

the sacred power he has received, celebrates the Holy Sacrifice in which Jesus Christ renews the one immolation which he enacted on Calvary for the redemption of the human race, and the Heavenly Father's glory". (Encyclical *Sacerdotti Nostri Primordia*, 1959, para. 34.)

It is through the ordinary papal magisterium that we derive the summary and perfection of the teaching of Trent, that *the Sacrifice of the Mass is the renewal of the Sacrifice of the Cross*. Yet Bishop Alan Clark has the audacity to claim that it is one of "the two pivotal doctrines of eucharistic faith" that "the eucharist is the *memorial* of the death and resurrection of Christ, whose atoning sacrifice reconciled the word to God" (*Ministry and Ordination*, 1973, page 2). In his summary of the Ministerial Agreement, Bishop Clark correctly speaks (page 16) of its teaching on the eucharist "as the memorial of Christ's sacrifice for the salvation of the world", because in the crucial paragraph 13 of the Statement itself we are told: "the eucharist is the memorial of the sacrifice of Christ". What the Mass is a memorial of, as the *Catechism of Christian Doctrine* teaches us, is "the Passion and Death of our Lord" (Question 280). But it is precisely a memorial of that Passion and Death in being the *renewal* of the Sacrifice of the Cross. The teaching of the Agreed Statement is the very heresy condemned by Trent (cf. Session XXII, canon 3), succinctly taught in the *Catechism of the Anglican Book of Common Prayer* (1662): "*Question*. Why was the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper ordained? *Answer*. For the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ and of the benefits we receive thereby".

Preconciliar Writers not Clear

While preconciliar Catholic writers have been careful to teach the dogma of the Sacrifice of the Mass, they have not for the most part given much attention to the key question of what it is which makes the Mass a sacrifice, indeed one and the same sacrifice with that of the Cross. The kind of explanation, based upon the Tridentine Catechism, formerly supplied in the CTS Simple Prayer Book, contributes little to one's understanding. To say "It is the same Sacrifice as that of Calvary because the Victim and the Priest are the

same", is no explanation. The real presence of Christ, Priest and Victim, after the consecration, does not constitute a sacrifice, otherwise the Sacrifice would continue as long as and wherever the Blessed Sacrament was reserved. Again, the mere sacrificial wording of the post-consecration Canon cannot constitute the real presence of the body and blood of Christ a sacrificial offering, otherwise a priest could simply take the Blessed Sacrament from the tabernacle and say the second part of the Canon, and have thereby a literal "Mass of the Presanctified".

Popes Absolutely Clear

No, the Popes are absolutely clear, exercising their ordinary magisterium, that the two-fold consecration is the essential sacrificial act, and that the rest of the Canon and other prayers only prolong in expression, by way of anticipation and recapitulation, what is accomplished at the two-fold consecration. Pius XII explains: "Our Redeemer's sacrifice is marvellously shown forth by external signs symbolic of death. By the transubstantiation of bread into the body of Christ and of wine into His blood both his body and blood are rendered really present; but the eucharistic species under which He is present symbolize the violent separation of His body and blood, and so a commemorative showing forth of the death which took place in reality on Calvary is repeated in each Mass, because by distinct representations Christ Jesus is signified and shown forth in the state of victim" (*Mediator Dei*, 1947; para. 74). The two-fold act of transubstantiation is itself constitutive of the renewed immolation of Christ our Sacrifice.

Mass as Renewal of the Sacrifice of the Cross

Let us now attempt to obtain some understanding of how the Mass, centering on the two-fold consecration, is the renewal of the Sacrifice of the Cross—not a mere symbol of it but, in truth, its effective sign (the Sacrament of the Passion as St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas call it) — without getting lost in gratuitous supposition. As the Sacrifice of the Mass is the renewal of that of Calvary, it is relative to it, and we would be advised to begin by asking ourselves in what the Sacrifice of the Cross consisted. Our

Lord Jesus Christ offered the whole of his human life on earth to the service of God the Father. He consummated his offering of himself (having already symbolised it at the institution of the Holy Eucharist) by pouring out his life-blood on the cross in sacrifice for us; "Father, forgive them they know not what they do". Because this self-oblation was the act of God the Son, it was of infinite value, and necessarily accepted. But Our Lord's giving of his human nature to God the Father — as also to his own Divine Person and to the Holy Ghost — while complete from the side of his offering at the moment of his death on the cross, had still to be completed on the side of the manifestation of its acceptance. To sacrifice is to give a gift to God. The element of destruction is to remove the gift from secular use and to indicate the wish that God should possess it (and the persons it typifies). Yet God is the one who accepts and, in a perfect sacrifice, God, literally takes the victim to himself; and not only in figure, as by sending down fire to consume a holocaust. Hence it was that Our Lord's sacrifice of himself, complete from his side as giver on the cross, was fulfilled and manifestly accepted by the glorification of the Resurrection and the Ascension, when the accepted victim of the cross was manifestly taken into the heavenly sanctuary.

How does this fuller view of sacrifice—taught in the Epistle to the Hebrews—viewed not only from the side of the immolation but also from its acceptance, relate to the Sacrifice of the Mass? Surely in this way:

The two-fold consecration is Christ Our Lord's own designation (the priest speaks "*in persona Christi*") of the species of bread and wine as His body and blood. In the very act by which Christ himself designates them signs of his body and blood separated in his sacrificial death for us, they become what they signify, Christ's body and blood, now risen and glorified (hence with His soul as well as His Divinity). It is the glorified and accepted heavenly victim of Calvary, the Lamb as though slain yet living of the Apocalypse, who is now on the earthly altar; precisely because the symbolic offering is taken up to the heavens. Christ gave himself in death on the cross. The acceptance of that perfect sacrifice was manifested and completed by

the Resurrection to glory and the Ascension into the heavenly sanctuary. By Christ's own institution, designation and act, the symbolic death of the consecration (representing Calvary) is accepted as what it signifies, and in the very act becomes the real accepted victim of Calvary, risen and ascended into the heavens.

The consecration is the sacrament of the passion: it signifies the sacrificial death and, effecting what it signifies, the symbolic body and blood of the dead Christ become the real, risen and glorified Priest and Victim.

The explanation of how the Mass is a sacrifice, and how that sacrifice is one and the same with that of the Cross, has the strength that it fully utilises what the Popes teach us on the subject, and what we learn from the sources of revelation about the Sacrifice of the Cross itself (especially from the Epistle to the Hebrews), without having to postulate any additional, and intrinsically unconvincing, metaphysical data. It also has the virtue of allowing us to appreciate more fully the soundness of the Roman Canon and Tridentine offertory prayers. When we appreciate that it is by Christ the Priest's own designation, through the words of consecration spoken in His person by the ordained priest, that the species of bread and wine become the effective signs of his body and blood separated in sacrificial death on the Cross, and by the same act contain the term of that oblation, the risen and ascended Victim at the right hand of the Eternal Father—then we may understand how, prior to the consecration, the bread and wine are simultaneously treated as symbolically the body and blood of Christ which we wish to offer to the Father, and also as something yet to be accepted. It is only at the consecration that they become what they already symbolise; are accepted as and made to be what they signify.

Thus, at the start of the Roman Canon the celebrant prays: "*uti accepta habeas, et benedicas, haec dona, haec munera, haec sancta sacrificia illibata*" (to accept and bless these gifts, these presents, these unspotted sacrifices). Symbolically already the holy, unspotted body and blood of Christ separated in sacrificial death, they have still to be prayed for and blessed until they are the Divine Victim in his accepted reality. Because Christ our Lord has placed

his perfect offering at the disposal of members of his Mystical Body, who can make it their own more or less worthily and fully by their offering of themselves with Christ their Head, a worthy fulfilment of the Divine mandate has to be prayed for at each Mass. That is why, just as the Divine approval of the symbolism is anticipated before the Consecration, so afterwards, in the "*Supplices*", the consciousness that this consummated offering is our offering, makes the celebrant still pray that precisely, as our offering, it may be borne by the Angel of God to the heavenly altar, even though already that has been accomplished so far as Our Lord's own renewal of His sacrifice is concerned.

The Three New Canons by Contrast

By contrast, the three New Canons have no such anticipatory references to the Divine Victim's body and blood, but only to the "gifts"—and these have been offered simply as bread and wine to become our spiritual food and drink in the new "offertory" prayers. After the Consecration, there are in the New Canons what an Evangelical member of the Anglican/R.C. International Commission has described as "echoes of the pre-Reformation language of sacrifice", though in Canon II it is fair to say that the "echoes" have died away to the point of inaudibility. When a Catholic alert to Catholic doctrine examines the *Novus Ordo Missae*, it is precisely "echoes" of the (pre-Vatican II-Reform) language of sacrifice which he hears. The substance has been effectively eliminated. Not that this entails that the *Novus Ordo* is invalid, even when celebrated with Canon II. Apart from the guarantee which as Catholics we believe attaches to a rite promulgated by the Vicar of Christ — so that it is valid and capable of bearing an orthodox sense — it is the instituting words of Christ which constitute the essence of the Mass, and these themselves designate it a sacrifice.

Catholic Worship Should be an Apt Expression of Catholic Faith

However, Catholic worship should be an apt expression of Catholic Faith. As doctrine has developed through the Church collectively making a more thorough appropriation

of the deposit of faith, committed to the Apostles by Christ and through the Holy Ghost, and preserved in Sacred Scripture and Tradition; so the Church has developed her liturgical and devotional expression of Catholic Truth. It is at the least an impoverishment of the Catholic life of the faithful to discard the more explicit expression of the developed faith of the Church as found in the traditional liturgy. It is scandalous and a betrayal of the Faith to eliminate from the Sacred Liturgy those clear expressions of the very dogmas most under attack by Modernists and Protestantisers in the contemporary Church. The actual expression "the Sacrifice of the Mass" is very rarely heard now from the lips of priests, and the writer's personal acquaintance with catechetical texts and knowledge of teachers and pupils reveals a terrible ignorance of the fact that the Mass is a Sacrifice, one and the same with that of Calvary. In this matter catechetical neglect and distortion interact and reinforce the liturgical revolution. Lack of knowledge of the dogma of the Eucharistic Sacrifice causes the faithful in general to see nothing wrong with the texts of the *Novus Ordo*. The silence and ambiguities of the *Novus Ordo* regarding its own nature as a rite for the renewal of the Sacrifice of the Cross, entails its failure as a mode of essential instruction for the people, and further encourages distorted catechesis on the Mass. Even among the older generations, the indications are that any concept of the Mass as being offered, is limited to the sense in which any act of worship or piety, for example a decade of the Rosary, can be offered for a certain intention. That Christ our Mediator has given to his Church a perpetual means by which we can make our own effective offering of His sacrificial death through the ministry of the ordained priesthood, is fast fading from the Catholic Church; in spite of its formal reaffirmation in some of the earlier solemn teachings of the present Holy Father (*Mysterium Fidei* and his *Credo*), and in the Declaration of the Congregation for Doctrine, *Mysterium Ecclesiae*, "against certain errors of the day".

Clear Teaching Imperative

The desperate straits into which the believing and worshipping Church on earth has sunk, make it imperative that

the Faith be taught at every level with greater clarity, care and explicitness than ever before, by such bishops, priests, parents and teachers as are conscious of their duty and capable of performing it; and that the traditional Roman Mass, according to the Tridentine Missal of St. Pius V, be celebrated wherever possible, in fervour and dignity, and in circumstances where the maximum number of the Faithful may be able to assist at it.

As a priest of the Birmingham diocese said publicly, after reading Archbishop Dwyer's pastoral summary and comments on the Holy Father's consistorial attack on the witness of Archbishop Lefebvre and other traditionalists against the false Reform: "It is not a schism of the Right which is the threat to the Church in this parish. It is the hundreds of people in our parish who reject the Papal teaching on faith and morals". Without an unambiguous reassertion of the Faith by our chief pastors, together with the restoration of its liturgical and devotional expression, the very existence of the Catholic Church in many places is now in jeopardy. When we assist at the Sacrifice of the Mass, we must offer it more fervently than ever: "*pro Ecclesia . . . sancta Catholica . . . cum . . . Papa nostro Paulo . . . et omnibus orthodoxis atque catholicae fidei cultoribus*".

Postscript

Since the above study was written, the veteran progressive liturgist, Father Clifford Howell S.J., has made public the interesting and significant fact that the "offertory" prayers of the Novus Ordo Missae were a compromise arrived at between the "liturgists" and the "curial party" on the Consilium. The "liturgists" apparently wanted to conform to "Cranmer's Godly Order" by having no prayers at all during the "Preparation of the Gifts", but the "curial party" insisted on having some. The compromise we know: "offertory" prayers acceptable to Protestants. (cf. *The Clergy Review*. February 1977, pages 59, note 2.)

We were very struck, at the time, by the speech made by Mr. Alfred Marnau, Chairman of the Latin Mass Society, on the occasion of its Annual General Meeting at the end of May, this year. Also, and equally, by a letter from Dr. (iur) Eric de Saventhem, President of the International Federation, "Una Voce". With the kind permission of these gentlemen, we publish below a major excerpt from Mr. Marnau's speech and, in full, the letter of Dr. de Saventhem, which was read to the meeting. We take the opportunity of drawing the attention of readers to the notice concerning the Latin Mass Society which appears on the outside of the back cover of this issue of "Christian Order".

A Speech and a Letter

THE SPEECH

ALFRED MARNAU

YOU will perhaps recall in this connection that I closed last year's address by saying that our constant prayer should be that this, our present Pontiff, so glorious in many ways, should restore the old Mass, and not the next, not some future Pope. This is still the case, this should still be our prayer. There have been so many evident signs in the reign of Pope Paul of intervention by the Holy Ghost—it could happen again.

One such divine intervention is powerfully described by Fr. Wiltgen in his celebrated book *The Rhine flows into the Tiber*. A small fraction of modernists and ecumaniacs was about to have a view imposed upon the Pope and the rest of the Council Fathers on the question of Collegiality. No less than the destruction of Papal supremacy was at stake. The Pope at first heeded no warning and stubbornly

refused to accept that this could possibly be their intention. Great evil often goes hand in hand with great stupidity. It is this element of stupidity that so often prevents evil from winning through. And here the Holy Ghost worked in such a way that through stupidity evil intention was revealed. One of their faction prematurely published a paper, setting out how certain ambiguous passages on Collegiality would be interpreted *after* the Council was over. This paper fell into the hands of moderate Council Fathers and was shown to the Pope. In Ft. Wiltgen's words, Pope Paul, realising that he had been deceived, broke down and wept.

And even more recently, there must have been the Holy Ghost at work again through the Vicar of Christ—I refer to the visit to Rome of Dr. Coggan. Once again, it seems, the worst was prevented, at least for the time being.

The question of Inter-communion seems to have been shelved. The Pope, to our joy, had acted in the fullness of his infallible power. Indeed, how could the idea of Inter-communion ever have been thought of! It was either valid or not valid when priests pleaded awestruck throughout the centuries: "Let not the partaking of Thy Body, O Lord Jesus Christ, which I, unworthy, presume to receive, turn to my judgment and condemnation". If these words are valid, as we must believe, how could we possibly invite those not of our Faith to expose themselves to the risk of eternal damnation! And how could Catholics be set at liberty to accept unconsecrated bread as the Body of Christ!

Considering these things, considering how the fate of the Church seems to hang constantly in the balance, does not our whole being cry out: *Veni, veni, Creator Spiritus!*

How necessary now to turn to Him for guidance this Whitsuntide, when all certainties are being questioned—yes, even Pope Paul's *Novus Ordo*, which was hailed at first by the modernists, by those same modernists who insult and persecute the old Mass most.

In a recent book by the Bishop of Strasbourg, *La Liberté d'un Eveque*, one reads that the reforms in the liturgy have to be regarded as a permanent evolution, leading, in the end, towards a Church without any Mass at all. We do not know whether the Holy Father was made aware of this

published view, or whether he wept, but we do know that Mgr. Elchinger was not suspended, let alone excommunicated.

The fate of the Church is in the balance, and we are perhaps witnessing the final assault, the final excesses, before novelty wears off and boredom sets in. What else can be the meaning of those 4000 documented cases of blasphemy, sacrilege and heresy, collated in a recent French publication. *Les Fumées de Satan*? Of priests, some unmarried, some married, con-celebrating, assisted by wives. Of priests putting the hosts after Mass into a paper bag, "because there is no real presence, once the Eucharist is over". Of priests denying the Real presence altogether, the divinity of Christ, the Immaculate Conception, the Resurrection, eternal life. Of a parish priest who asks children to come to him on the eve of their first communion and to bring their rosaries along—which he then takes from them to throw, in front of their uncomprehending eyes, into the fire.

Think if it, 4000 similar documented cases in France alone—and these things happen every day, these are not single events! Similar lists can be compiled, are being compiled, in what were once Catholic lands, in Austria, Germany, Belgium, Holland, Brazil . . . The most dismal aspect of all this is that bishops will not only tolerate but actually encourage these heresies, and even some of those who do not will tell you, if you bring them to their notice, that "all this is part of the trend in the Church, it reflects the mind of the Church"—what a distorted mind that must be!—and that these "experiments" are demanded and solidly backed by the majority. Let us remember this: history shows that brain-washed and manipulated majorities are suspect. Such a majority hailed Barabbas and condemned Christ.

THE LETTER

DR. ERIC DE SAVENTHEM

"Madame President,

May I, through you, address most cordial greetings to all the members of the Latin Mass Society—those who are

with you at this moment as well as those who could not come. As one of the Founder-Associations of the International Una Voce Federation, your Society has always been conscious of the supranational scope and importance of our struggle. At the same time, the Indult obtained for England and Wales by the late Cardinal Heenan has given you a special role and responsibility. The uniqueness of your position is shown by the fact that today's Meeting was preceded by a Tridentine High Mass sung in your Primate's own Cathedral and attended by well-nigh 2,000 Catholics whom nobody would dare accuse of schismatic or separatist tendencies. And, if surveys have any significance, there were this morning at least 667,000 other Catholics in England and Wales hoping and praying with us that this hallowed form of Holy Mass would soon return to their own Diocesan Cathedrals and Parish Churches.

Thanks to the Indult, the legitimacy of the aims which we pursue has not been seriously questioned in your countries, and most of your Bishops have been freely accessible to the Society's Officers and Diocesan Representatives. You have thus been able to argue our case, again and again, at the level of Episcopal responsibility; pressing for early and vigorous action in favour of total parity between the Old and New Rites. And I know that your appeals have not been in vain: several of your Bishops have in fact urged Rome to grant this request, for the sake of the Church's peace, unity and joy.

Yet, so far Rome has remained unyielding. Instead of re-admitting the Old Rite of the Mass as an always lawful form of Eucharistic Celebration side by side with the Reformed Rite, Cardinal Knox—who heads the Roman Congregation for Divine Worship—is bent on stamping out even the severely restricted use of the Old Rite still permitted under the Indult. And, although outlawing the pre-Conciliary Liturgy has clearly been the principal cause of growing defiance and disaffection among the most loyal sections of the Faithful, the promoters of this disastrous "hardline" policy still seem to have the upper hand in the Vatican. As a result, there is open confrontation—like the "Occupation" of the Parish Church of St. Nicholas-du-Chardonnet in Paris now in its fifteenth week—and dead-

lock, as in the recent meetings between Archbishop Lefebvre and two Vatican emissaries.

Vatican hardliners argue that no concessions can be made to those who have turned the Liturgy into "a field of battle against the Council and its reforms". But, if one wants to talk of the Liturgy—of the Mass—as a "field of battle", this charge must be levied above all against those who, for more than 15 years, have waged thereon a clandestine war against the Faith; viz. the "Research Professionals", that virtually omnipotent oligarchy raised to power by the two mainstreams of the post-Conciliar drive—the "return to the sources", and "Collegiality". It was in the name of this "return to the sources" that everything could, with seeming legitimacy, be called into question—from Holy Scripture to defined dogma, from Tradition with a capital T to the multiplicity of traditions. This oligarchy does not recognise, does not even know the meaning of abuse, excesses, scandals and sacrilege: everything is "Research" and thus everything is legitimate. And since these professional "Researchers" fashion the collegiate will of the Episcopal Conferences, there is nothing to stem the havoc which they wreak most scientifically at all levels of the Church's life and teaching. Nothing, in fact, except the passive infallibility of the "Sensus Fidei" of the People of God.

This, Madame President, is what the simple people who make up the People of God have had to live with ever since the Council. I submit that the crisis of the Liturgy, the crisis of the Mass, most definitely both precedes and transcends the conflict between Rome and Mgr. Lefebvre. Even if the Archbishop were to comply with the demands formulated in the Papal letter of October 11, 1976, this would in no way solve the liturgical crisis which has been causing so much suffering to millions of Catholics. And if we are bidden to show trust in our legitimate pastors, in the Pope above all and the Bishops in union with him, our answer is clear: We will do so joyously and with all our heart once we see His Holiness raising his standard as the true leader of the People of God on that very "Battlefield" which the Church's Liturgy has now become. Love of Truth, love of the Church, love of peace and Apostolic

solicitude all demand that the Pope himself and the Bishops in union with him should take decisive steps to restore the Liturgy of the Church to its essence, as the recent Council defined it: "A Sacred Action surpassing all others", and a "foretaste of that Heavenly Liturgy which is celebrated in the Holy City of Jerusalem, and in which Christ is sitting at the right hand of God, a Minister of the Sanctuary and of the true Tabernacle".

And if, Madame President, His Holiness should be dissuaded by his hardline advisers from following the dictates of Truth, Peace and Apostolic solicitude in this area which is vital for the Church's survival, then I submit that it is up to each individual Bishop to restore, within his Diocese, the preconciliar Rites to the honour and dignity which is rightfully theirs. To quote the Council once again: the Bishops are "the Governors, Promoters, and Guardians of the entire liturgical life in the Churches committed to their care". They have thus, both collectively and individually, a sacred right and duty to protect the liturgy from impoverishment and abuse. And they have the legal power to dispense, within their Dioceses, from the observance of General Church Law in liturgical matters. Thus without any violation of his duties to the Holy See, any Bishop may permit any of his clergy to use the Old Rite of Mass in preference to the New Rite for lawful reasons.

May the Holy Ghost preside at your Meeting, and may He enlighten and strengthen those who, in the succession of the Apostles, have been sent "to continue throughout the ages the work of Christ, the Eternal Pastor".

With my most cordial greeting and wishes to you all.

Any Questions

WILLIAM LAWSON, S.J.

Isn't there something sinister in the way we are being forced into membership of and dependence on groups?

I wonder what has made you so perceptive. Perhaps you are a member of a committee and you have become aware of influences within it which seem to be controlling and guiding it according to a preconceived plan. That experience, if it is as I have sketched it, could have prompted you to look around and to discover an extensive process of forming and then dominating small groups. That manner of power-seizure can be observed in the Church; and if local examples of it are part of a widespread pattern then it is indeed sinister. It would mean that, in the name of democracy, the Church is being sovietized—divided up, that is, into councils in which the individual members can be so worked on that they lose individuality and become mere units in a conforming majority.

Is that a factual description of what is happening, or is it the fantasy of a mind imagining plots and stratagems in the most innocent and healthy changes? There are, at least, grounds for suspicion. Councils, committees and conferences have proliferated in recent years, and many of them seem to have been taken over by members with a professional look about them—those who are free and eager to devote themselves to committee work, who make a career of it, and who know the techniques of committee management. Casual, amateur members, even if they know what is going on, can be manoeuvred into supporting the schemes and resolutions which the professionals have decided on before debate begins.

Communism owes much of its success to the practice of forcing people into groups where their individuality can be destroyed or, if it is indestructible, ostracized. In that craft, communism has many imitators, and some of them could be in the Church.

Is it true that the Church always reflects the society in which she lives ?

The Church is not a moon or a mirror. She has her own light, Who is Christ, the Light of the world. It is by that light she should shine—directly, and not by reflection.

As Christ does not abandon His Church, His light never fails. He is its permanent source, and it is always visible somewhere. But it has never yet been fully visible everywhere. Those who are supposed to be the light of the world, a city set on a hill, are human; and they are open to the temptation of preferring the half-light or the darkness of the society in which they live to the light of Christ. The history of the Church abounds with examples of Catholics, from the Popes downwards, who adopted the style and standards of their age and who were both in the world and of it. The hierarchy are always most exposed to the temptation of that kind of worldliness because it is their duty to deal with the civil power for the protection of the Church and her mission. The shadows of worldly wisdom have sometimes dimmed their true light, as with many bishops in the East under Constantine and his successors, and many in the West under Charlemagne and his successors; the German bishops who backed the Hohenstaufen emperors against the Papacy, and their successors, with two or three notable exceptions, who supported the Nazis; the English bishops who sided with Henry II against St. Thomas of Canterbury and with Henry VIII against the Pope; the French bishops who formulated and fought for the "Gallican Liberties" which gave the Church in France a nationalist and separatist tendency; and today not a few bishops in South America and elsewhere ready to do a deal with marxism. "So let your light shine before men . . . !" We need prayer and courage.

We have received the following comment on Father Lawson's answer to a question in the September issue of *Christian Order*. We are happy to print it.

Orthodox Christians must hold in conscience that the Orthodox Church is the only true Church. No local Orthodox Church, e.g. the Russian Orthodox Church, has ever claimed to be the whole Orthodox Church.

The Orthodox believe that since the Schism, the Roman Catholic Church has suffered from excessive rationalism in theology and from repeated reformation in Church government, liturgy and theology.

In the 15th century, under pressure from Roman Catholic emperors of Constantinople, many Greek bishops signed the Union of Florence, but the Orthodox Church remained firm in the person of Saint Mark of Ephesus. This created no schism among those who remained Orthodox although for a time Constantinople was in the hands of Byzantine-rite Roman Catholics.

Since Peter the Great, the Russian Church has almost constantly been subjugated to the Russian State, and at present, the whole Orthodox Church has its own crisis: the Moscow Patriarchate, controlled and infiltrated by the Soviet Government (as are Roman Catholic and Protestant Churches in several East European countries), together with the Patriarchates of Constantinople and Rumania, are flirting with the ecumenist heresy. Preparations are being made for a Council to up-date Orthodoxy, a milder form of Vatican II; if it ever takes place, the faithful will reject such a Council.

Many Orthodox fear that the ecumenist heresy will lead to the creation of a world-wide apostate pseudo-Church and pray that they will be protected from such an apocalyptic catastrophe.

From an Orthodox priest under the jurisdiction
of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of
Russia

Book Reviews

DEVIL'S BREW

The Fraudulent Gospel : Politics and the World Council of Churches by Bernard Smith; published by Foreign Affairs Publishing Co. Ltd., 139 Petersham Road, Richmond, Surrey TW10 7AA; pp. 100; £1 or \$2.00.

Darkness into Light by Father Matthew Ruf, SMB; published by Bethlehem Office, 36 Hyde Vale, Greenwich, London SE10 8QH; pp. 74; 95p.

Christian Prisoners in the USSR 1977 by Keston College Staff; published by Centre for the Study of Religion and Communism, Keston College, Keston, Kent BR2 6BA; pp. 53 (large); 70p.

Twenty-eight years ago—in 1949, on the heels of World War II—that great Pope, Pius XII, addressed over the radio a great congress (Katholikentag) of Austro-German Catholics in Vienna. I remember two sentences from his address and I quote both of them here from memory: “In God alone”, he said, “is man free. If he abandons God he delivers himself straightaway into the hands of totalitarian regimes”. I have never forgotten those words. The World Council of Churches has. Inevitably, therefore, it has landed, ideologically and practically, in Marxist arms.

In the course of this excellent booklet, Bernard Smith shows exactly what this means. The ideological creed of the W.C.C. is “secular ecumenism”, meaning by this that what it seeks is not the union of men in God’s truth, but their coming together on the basis of an urge, devoid of supernatural content, that concentrates totally on the material advancement of mankind. Inevitably, therefore, the secular ecumenism of the W.C.C. has for its goal secular salvation. Of necessity it is earth-bound; as such, the ally of other creeds and ideologies whose outlook is confined to no more than man’s material condition; in sympathy, therefore, and, indeed, in alliance with Marxist-Socialism and its revolution in aid of a classless society, which is

thought of so naively as necessarily non-exploiting. It would seem that men never learn. Milovan Djilas' great book — *The New Class*—might never have been written. Memories are always short in these things. In this case, tragically so.

In the eyes of the W.C.C., the revolution is the sole reality because what is thought of as the oppression of the capitalist world is, in their very simple view, the only evil. And the Christian has to fight evil; which means that he must be for ongoing revolution, which becomes, under such circumstances, its own morality. We are very close to Lenin here. That which supports the revolution is good: that which impedes it is bad. For the W.C.C. type of Christian, redemption can only be through revolutionary violence. His life is the class war. God — if he exists — talks best through the barrel of a gun. And if there is no God? The gun is as good.

Bernard Smith brings this out brilliantly in his well-documented pages. Brilliantly, too, he brings out the methods used by the W.C.C. to condition its members into acceptance of its secular, revolutionary creed. By this time, the methods are well known — group sensitivity — training to condition the Christian mass and, then, the use of democratic centralism to manipulate the mass so conditioned. So the few, who know what it is all about, take over the wills of confused and conditioned men; then, in their name and on their behalf, they speak to the world and reveal Christianity increasingly as the ally everywhere of mindless, revolutionary change in aid of the class war. At this stage, I would think that the KGB looks on with great amusement at the whole business. It has reason to be amused. The Christians — Catholics not excluded, but well to the fore — are putting the whole world in its lap. That is what the KGB wants and this is why its members are now amused. They never thought it would be so dead easy. "All these things I will give you if, bowing down, you will adore me". This is precisely what the W.C.C. is doing. This, I am afraid, is what the Catholic Church is tending to do — to the extent that it adopts, at many clerical levels, a line not dissimilar to that urged on it by the W.C.C. But Christ told Satan to be gone. The W.C.C. has told Christ to do the same. "He that is not with me is

against me". There can be no question as to where the W.C.C.'s coarsened conglomerate of Churchmen now stands.

There are minor points in Bernard Smith's account that I could not wholly agree with. I would find a bone or two to pick with him in his chapters on Southern Africa and South Korea; and there appears, at times in his writing, an implication that the capitalist system, as it stands now, is sufficient answer to—a kind of bulwark against—Marxism. With this I do not agree. But these points are not central to his thesis, which is magnificently upheld throughout and with which I wholly concur. I think readers should make a very special point of reading this book and studying it. I hope it will get into the hands of Catholic bishops throughout the world. I would like to see it in the Secretariat of State at the Vatican. Nothing would please me more than the thought that Archbishop Casaroli, with puckered brow, was thoughtfully turning its pages.

Shortly before I picked up Bernard Smith's booklet I read with admiration and great joy a short account of his time in Communist gaols in China by my friend Father Matthew Ruf of the Bethlehem Fathers. He was a missionary in Manchuria and hauled off to prison with others when Mao Tsetung's "liberators" marched in to "free" the people, amongst other things, from the clerico-fascist lackeys of imperialism, who had been battenning on them for years in the guise of missionaries. In his moving account of his prison days, you have from Father Ruf the simple, quiet—at times intensely human and intensely humorous—account by a wonderful and totally unassuming priest of what he went through at the hands of his Chinese Communist gaolers. One thing comes shining through his pages—the immense strength of the supernatural—the wonder of God's Grace—in the shape of a radiant faith that never faltered, never failed. And then, you think of the W.C.C. and you say, What have they got? And the answer is, Nothing; nothing at all by comparison with the pearl of great price, which Father Matthew Ruf had received at baptism, treasured through boyhood and priesthood, in gaol and out of it—all the days of his life.

That priceless pearl has sustained many, many others besides Father Ruf and will continue to do so. In evidence, let readers turn to *Christian Prisoners in the USSR 1977*, a Keston College Staff Study. Let them brood quietly over its pictures and pages and let them realise as they do so that there is essentially but one thing we must do now, if we want to see our way—clear and straight always; one thing the Catholic Church must do if it wants to drag itself out of the confusion it has thrust on itself. What every Catholic must do; what the Catholic Church must do is to stop immersing itself in the secular and turn instead directly, straightforwardly — and with much simplicity and love — to Christ its Founder. The answer is there in Him; not in the secularized policies and politics of the World Council of Churches. The end of that road is spiritual death and despair. It is Christ alone Who gives life.

Paul Crane, S.J.

LAMENT FOR WALSINGHAM

Levell, levell with the ground
the towres doe lye
Which with their golden glitteringe tops
Pearsed once to the skye :
Wher weare gates, no gates ar nowe
the waies unknowen
Wher the presse of peares did passe
while her fame far was blowen.

Weepe, weepe, o Walsingham
Whose dayes are nightes
Blessinges turned to blasphemies
Holy deedes to dispites,
Sinne is wher our Ladie sate
Heaven turned is to Hell.
Satan sittes wher our Lord did swaye
Walsingham oh farewell.

—Anonymous, 16th century, included in
“Recusant Poets”.